

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20094 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-515 Year-2025 Thana- KATEYA District- Gopalganj

Vijay Chand Kumhar @ Vijaychand Kohar @ Vijay Chandra Kumhar @
Vijay Chandra Kohar @ Bichchan Son of Bhangi Kumhar @ Bhangi Prasad
R/O Village - Ameya, P.S.- Kateya, District - Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vikash Kumar Shukla

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Ataur Rahman

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 5 29-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Kateya P.S. Case No.515 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109, 303(2), 352, 351(2) of the B.N.S., 2023.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges that accused persons including the petitioner came to his house on 12.09.2025 at 7 P.M. and started abusing, on protest, petitioner assaulted the informant by *Dab* (axe) causing injury on head, thereafter Sandeep assaulted him by farsha causing



injury on head, while Pushpa Devi assaulted the informant by *Gandasa* causing injury, thereafter Sandeep assaulted his nephew by farsha causing injury on head and petitioner assaulted by *Gandasa* and Pushpa assaulted Reeta by *Gandasa* causing injury on head and Sandeep assaulted Archana by Dab causing injury on head and petitioner snatched chain of his nephew.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that petitioner and the informant are co-villager and are having dispute relating to passage and thus an altercation took place, in which both side assaulted each other. It is also submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that specific allegation of assaulting the informant by *Gandasa* is alleged against petitioner, Sandeep and Pushpa, as such it cannot be alleged with certainty that whose blow caused injury to the informant.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and the 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 head is a vital part of the body and specific allegation of assaulting the informant on head



by *Gandasa* is against petitioner and Pushpa. It is also submitted that from perusal of the order impugned, it would manifest that four injuries have been found on the person of the injured i.e. informant and two injuries have been opined to be grievous in nature.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

