

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32792 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-296 Year-2025 Thana- KOILWAR District- Bhojpur

Manjit Bind @ Manjit Kumar Son of Jagan Bind Resident of Village-
Mahadeochak Semaria, P.S.- Koilwar, District- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ramanuj Tiwary

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ajay Kumar No. 2

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 16-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest
in Koilwar P. S. Case No.296 of 2025 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 25(1-b)a, 26 and 35 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 based on secret information that house of Saraswati Devi
was raided and from her house, a country-made rifle and a
country-made double barrel gun was recovered and she disclosed
that the arms belongs to petitioner who had given her to keep it
secretly.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case based on
confessional statement of Sarawasti Devi in police custody which



does not have any evidentiary value. It is also submitted that petitioner has no concern or relation with Saraswati Devi or husband Sanjay Bind.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that from perusal of the pleadings made in the anticipatory bail application, it manifests that petitioner knows Saraswati Devi and her husband Sanjay Bind, but then has not pleaded that he had any enmity with them nor has disclosed what the petitioner does for earning her living-hood. It is next submitted that off late in the State of Bihar, illegal weapons are being rampantly used in occurrences. It is further submitted that investigation in the case is continuing and interrogation of the petitioner is required.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submissions made by the 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	
---	--	---	--

