

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14057 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-195 Year-2022 Thana- SHASTRINAGAR District- Patna

Md. Adib @ Imran Alam @ Adib Ahmad @ Adeeb Ahmad Son of Md. Sajjad @ Md. Sajjad Alam Resident of village- Samanpura, Raja Bazar, Police Station- Shastri Nagar, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arvind Kumar Mouar, Adv
Mr. Raj Krishna Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP
Mr. Amit Narayan, Adv

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 29-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri Arvind Kumar Mouar; learned A.P.P. for the State, Sri Chandra Bhushan Prasad, and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection Shastri Nagar PS Case No. 195 of 2022 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 342, 323, 324, 354, 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of ten cases and the informant alleges that on 14.04.2022 at 3.22 P.M. her son (Md. Amir) was coming back home by his scooty, when he was intercepted by the



petitioner, who threatened to withdraw the cases instituted earlier or else he will be killed and also abused on account of which an altercation started and petitioner took out a scissor from his bag and assaulted her son but her son managed to save himself and fled and came back home and disclosed about the occurrence, hence informant along with her other family members came to make petitioner understand and they saw the petitioner carrying scissor, further petitioner's brothers (Anaf and Ayan) also came and petitioner assaulted her son by scissor but her son got saved suffering injury on neck and Md. Anaf assaulted her daughter by fist repeatedly causing injury on stomach and snatched her chain and pushed her husband.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that no doubt petitioner carries antecedent of 10 cases, but then 6 cases have been instituted from the side of the informant. It is further submitted that falsity of the allegation would manifest from the fact that informant alleges that on 14.04.2022 at 3.22 P.M. when her son was coming back home on his scooty, the petitioner intercepted and threatened him to withdraw earlier cases and even tried to assault him by a scissor but his son got saved and



came back home and informed about the occurrence. It is submitted that it does not appear probable that informant along with her family members including the daughter would have come to the place of occurrence to make the petitioner understand after coming to know about the occurrence as disclosed by her son, when petitioner already was implicated in six cases by the side of the informant. It is also submitted that from side of the petitioner, six cases have been instituted against the informant and her side, which amply demonstrates that petitioner and the informant are on litigating term. It is next submitted that two other sons of the informant assaulted the petitioner earlier for which Shastri Nagar P.S. Case No.194 of 2022 came to be instituted. It is submitted that on account of assault, the petitioner suffered hearing loss. It is further submitted that in Shastri Nagar P.S. Case No.194 of 2022, the charge-sheet was submitted under various sections of the IPC including Section 308 of the IPC but then the learned Magistrate differing with the police report, took cognizance under Section 307 of the IPC. It is also submitted that side of the informant intends to purchase the land of the father of the petitioner and since petitioner's father is not willing to sell the land, as such the informant and her side are trying to implicate petitioner in



false cases with a view to coerce his father into submission.

Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that no doubt 6 cases have been instituted against the petitioner by the informant and her side but then there must be some reason for instituting case. It is next submitted that a counter-affidavit has been filed wherein it has been specifically pleaded that petitioner resides diagonally to the residence of the informant and keeps stalking the young unmarried daughters of the informant and whenever daughters of the informant come on their balcony or terrace, the petitioner takes pictures through mobile and makes indecent poses, further he has made the life of the daughters of the informant difficult to move on the road. It is also pleaded that daughters of the informant are pursuing LLB degree course from Bihar Institute of Law, Raja Bazar, Patna and whenever they go to attend college and any other places, he stalks them and follows them by taking their picture. It is further submitted that at para-5 it has been specifically pleaded that the reasons for the petitioner stalking the unmarried daughters of the informant is his obsession towards the daughters of the informant. It is next



submitted that Shastri Nagar PS Case No. 374 of 2023 was instituted against the petitioner from the side of the informant with an allegation that he had threatened the father of the informant to withdraw earlier cases and also made indecent gesture which got captured in the CCTV installed in the house of the informant and the said photograph is annexed as Annexure-OP2/1 at page-9 to the counter-affidavit. It is also submitted that from perusal of the photograph of the petitioner, it would manifest that in the CCTV the petitioner was captured with his pants and underwear down and had taken out his private parts, on which the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that an insect had gone inside the underwear of the petitioner on account of which the petitioner had to open his pants and underwear for evicting the insect, on which learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that the photograph in itself shows the manner in which the petitioner acted and a bald plea is being taken to justify the action of the petitioner. It is also submitted that the manner in which the petitioner behaves and acts with the informant and his daughters is reprehensible. It is next submitted that no mother would come forward for instituting an FIR where her own daughters are involved until and unless the mother has no option but to seek



help of police.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submission made by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant and also the fact that petitioner has antecedent of ten cases, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

