

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13587 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-334 Year-2025 Thana- MUNGER MUFFASIL District- Munger

Md. Jeyauddin @ Jiyauddin Son of Late Md. Mazhar Resident of Mirzapur
Bardah, P.S.- Muffasil, District - Munger.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajit Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Surendra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA

ORAL ORDER

2 18-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 25(1-AA), 25(1-B)(a), 25(1-B)(c), 25(1)(a), 25(1-A), 26(1), 26(2), 35 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the F.I.R., on secret information that the arms were being manufactured, the informant along with police personnel reached at the spot and saw two persons attempting to flee, out of whom one was apprehended, who disclosed his name as Ibrar Ali and also disclosed the name of the person who fled away as Md. Jeyauddin (petitioner). Upon search of the house, firearms and other incriminating articles were recovered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the First Information Report was lodged on the basis of a confidential information that arms were being manufactured in the house of one Ibrar Ali, who is the son of the present petitioner and upon



raid, the said Ibrar Ali was arrested on the spot and the person who fled away was named as present petitioner. It has further been submitted that the petitioner does not have any connection with the manufacture of arms etc., and he has been made an accused only because of Ibrar Ali. It has further been submitted that the petitioner is a man aged about 75 years and is ready to co-operate in the investigation and trial.

5. Learned APP for the State opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail on the ground that recovery of several materials, which include manufacturing materials of firearms, were recovered from the house of this petitioner and the petitioner also bears one criminal antecedent, which is also of similar nature, as such, he does not deserve privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances and also considering the fact that almost a mini gun factory is running from the house of the petitioner and he has one criminal antecedent of similar nature, this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. As such, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No.334 of 2025.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

anand/-

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

