

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17140 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-172 Year-2025 Thana- KUDHNI District- Muzaffarpur

1. Arvind Kumar @ Arvind Kumar Bhakt S/o Late Nagendra Bhagat @ Lalu Bhagat R/o village- Kerma Dih, PS- Kudhani, District- Muzaffarpur
2. Vimal Kumar Singh @ Bimal Kumar S/o Late Vishwanath Singh R/o vill- Jagdishpur, P.S. - Maniyari, Distt.- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Hari Kishore Thakur, Advocate
For the State	:	Mrs. Sharda Kumari, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Abhash, Advocate
	:	Mr. Raju Kumar, Advocate
	:	Mr. Pradhan Murli Manohar Prasad, Advocate
	:	Mr. Jitendra Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 25-03-2026 Heard Mr. Hari Kishore Thakur, learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP representing the State as also learned counsel representing the informant.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Kudhani P.S. Case No. 172 of 2025 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 109, 303(2), 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, lodged on 03.12.2025 by the informant Rammilan Bhagat.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant has lodged the F.I.R. from Sadar Hospital, Muzaffarpur alleging that



while he had gone to bring cement and rod for the construction of boundary wall, the accused persons stopped, abused and allegation against these two petitioners is/are of causing injury to his brother Shiv Shankar and nephew Ratnesh Kumar and both sustained injuries/hands were broken. This led to the F.I.R..

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that there is case and counter case, the informant was aggressor, a scuffle took place but an exaggerated F.I.R. has been lodged.

5. Learned counsel for the informant on the other hand has provided the report of the Sadar Hospital, Muzaffarpur to show that the injury inflicted by both the petitioners have been found to be grievous in nature.

6. Considering the submissions of the parties and the nature of injuries that has come against the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to extend them the privilege of anticipatory bail.

7. The anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

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

