

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29931 of 2025

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

Pankaj Kumar son of Ambika Ray Resident of Parmanandpur PS- Pahaleja
District -Saran Bihar

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sanjeet Kumar @ Sanjeet Kumar Rai son of Ravindra Rai Resident of
Parmanandpur PS- Sonpur, District -Saran Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Dr. Ranjeet Kumar, Advocate Mr. Kanishk Kaustubh, Advocate Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate Mr. Rohan Sinha, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Madhura Nand Jha, 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 no.2.

2. This application has been filed for

cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the opposite party no.

2 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



no.2 on the ground that as per the F.I.R. he is the main assailant of 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 no.2 and did not sent him for trial, however, the Magistrate differing with the final form taken cognizance against the opposite party no.2.

5. Considering the fact that the opposite party no.2 was exonerated by the investigating agency, I am of the view that the grant of anticipatory bail to the opposite party no. 2 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	
---	--	---	--

