

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13495 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-78 Year-2023 Thana- TURKAULIYA District- East Champaran

Bhabhichhan Ram @ Bhavikshan Ram @ Bhabhighan Ram S/O Harikhishan
Ram @ Hari Khishun Ram Resident of Village- Majuraha, P.S- Raghunathpur
O.P (Turkuliya, Distt.- East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shanti Bhushan Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Aslam Ansari, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 29-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending arrest in connection with Turkauliya (Raghunathpur O.P.) P.S. Case No. 78 of 2023, dated 18.01.2023, lodged under Sections 304(B) & 34 of the Indian Penal Code, pending before the Court of C.J.M., East Champaran (Motihari).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that admittedly this is the second anticipatory bail application. However, during the course of investigation, a series of materials have come on record, therefore, the points may be considered and bail be granted on merits.

4. Learned APP for the State, on the other hand, submits that the petitioner has moved before this Court and has



taken the plea that he was in Karnataka, which he seeks to advance in the present bail application.

5. Upon perusal of the record and hearing the parties, it transpires to this Court that in the second bail application, the petitioner seeks to rely upon and produce all the documents collected by the police to show that he was in Karnataka, including flight tickets, an engagement card, etc. From the rejection order of the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner dated 13.07.2023 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 26259 of 2023, it is evident that the petitioner had taken the plea that at the time of the death, he was in Karnataka and not in Patna.

6. This Court is of the view that the petitioner has come with the same plea, save and except that he now seeks to place supporting documents in its proof. This Court is further of the view that it is entirely the same point which the petitioner had earlier raised and considered.

7. As such, the second anticipatory bail application is not maintainable and is accordingly dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Aman Kumar/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

