

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16026 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-376 Year-2025 Thana- SARAIYA District- Muzaffarpur

Praveen Kumar son of Lutan Raay Resident of Village -Rajarampur PS
-Saraiya, Dist- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Dr. Bipin Chandra, Adv.

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 17-06-2026 Heard Dr. Bipin Chandra, learned Advocate for the

petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the

State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Saraiya P.S. Case No. 376 of 2025, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(2),
109, 303(2) and 352 read with section 3(5) of the BNS.

3. The allegation against the petitioner is of causing
assault by means of iron rod over the head of the informant due
to which she sustained grievous injury.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner taking this
Court through the FIR contended that the alleged occurrence
took place on 27.06.2025 but the present FIR came to be
instituted on 03.07.2025, after a delay of six days and no proper



explanation has been given. It is further contended that only on account of the fact that four teeth have been broken on account of assault being made, the injury has been termed to be grievous, however, the same has occurred on account of a free fight. The petitioner is said to be a man of fair antecedent.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that the informant had only tried to intervene between the members of two groups but she was brutally assaulted by this petitioner due to which she sustained a grievous injury below her eye and jaw. So far the delay is concerned, it is submitted that since the informant was under her treatment at SKMCH, Muzaffarpur and when she regained consciousness, the present FIR came to be instituted.

6. Having considered the submissions advanced by the learned Advocates for the respective parties and taking note of the fact that the petitioner is the author of the grievous injury and the delay has been explained properly, this Court is not inclined to extend the prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioner stands rejected.

7. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the



court below, preferably within a period of four weeks from today, his prayer for bail shall be considered without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

(Harish Kumar, J)

Anjani/-

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

