

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22103 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2 Year-2026 Thana- ARARIA District- Araria

Md. Tahsin @ Md. Tahmim @ Md. Tamim @ Touseem S/O Md. Sajjad @
Sajaad @ Sajjad Resident of Village- Ajmatpur, P.S- Baiganchhi, Distt.-
Araria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Sanjay Kumar Mandal Mr.Kamlesh Kumar Pathak
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Rabindra Kumar, APP Mr.Dheeraj Kumar Mr.Priyadarshi

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 19-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP Sri Rabindra Kumar for the State and the learned counsel
appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 126(2), 109 and 61(2) of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of
the Arms Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the
informant alleges that on 27.12.2025 at about 6:00 PM,
petitioner called him and asked to come near Hariyali market for
some important work. Accordingly, the informant along with



others went to the place of occurrence where from before petitioner along with Md. Akib, Chhotu and Md. Istkhar were present. It is next alleged that Md. Akib got the informant identified thereafter accused Md. Istkhar took out a pistol from his waist and tried to fire, but Chhotu took the said arms and fired at the informant causing injury on his neck.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that specific allegation of firing causing injury to the informant is against Chhotu.

5. The learned A.P.P. as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of informant opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that it was petitioner who had called the informant to the place of occurrence and based on his call, the informant reached the place of occurrence where petitioner was present from before and thereafter Chhotu fired causing injury on his neck. It is submitted that no doubt, petitioner is not alleged to have fired but then his presence at the place of occurrence coupled with the fact that he had called the informant emboldened the accused persons to commit the



occurrence of firing leading to injury.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the informant as well as learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

