

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29020 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-66 Year-2024 Thana- Pahelja P.S. District- Saran

=====

Pankaj Kumar S/O Ambika Ray Resident of Parmanandpur, PS- Pahaleja,
District- Saran, Bihar- 841101

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Aamir Rai S/O Indradeo Rai Resident of Govind Chowk, PS- Sonpur,
District- Saran, Bihar
3. Arun Kumar, son of Paras Rai, resident of village- Rahimpur, P.S.- Sonpur,
District- Saran.
4. Suraj Kumar @ Suraj Singh, son of Munna Singh, resident of village-
Sonepur Nakhas, P.S.- Hariharnath, District- Saran at Chapra.

... .. Opposite Parts

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Dr. Ranjeet Kumar, Advocate Mr. Kanishk Kaustubh, Advocate Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate Mr. Rohan Sinha, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Mukesh Kumar Singh, APP
For the Opp. Party No.2	:	Mr. Bindhyachal Singh, Sr. Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 16-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP

for the State and learned Senior Counsel for the opposite party

nos.2 to 4

2. This application has been filed for

cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the opposite party

nos. 2 to 4 by the learned Additional District & Sessions Judge,

IV, Saran, *vide* order dated 18.03.2025, in connection with



Pahelaja P.S. Case No.66 of 2024 registered for the offence under sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code and under section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has prayed for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the opposite party nos. 2 to 4 on the ground that as per the F.I.R. they are accused of killing the deceased.

4. I have perused the impugned order. From the records, it appears that the case was investigated by the Police and after investigation, the Police submitted the final form exonerating the opposite party nos. 2 to 4 and did not sent him for trial, however, the Magistrate differing with the final form taken cognizance against the opposite party nos. 2 to 4

5. Considering the fact that the opposite party nos. 2 to 4 was exonerated by the investigating agency, I am of the view that the grant of anticipatory bail to the opposite party nos. 2 to 4 cannot be interfered with by this Court.

6. In view of the above, I do not find any illegality or infirmity in the impugned order. Accordingly, this application is rejected.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made herein are limited to the adjudication of the present



application and this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

pawan/-

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

