

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.34242 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-293 Year-2025 Thana- DARPA District- East Champaran

Abhimanyu Kumar son of Sahdev Singh Resident of Village - Sukhlahiya
Darpa, Ward No. 01, P.S. - Darpa, District - East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Madhurendra Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bharat Bhushan, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY

ORAL ORDER

4 23-07-2026

Heard Mr. Madhurendra Kumar, learned Counsel

for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Darpa P.S. Case No. 293 of 2025 for the offence registered under sections 103(1), 61(2) of the BNS and 27 of Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution story, the wife of the deceased, Soni Nishad alleged that her husband was a candidate for a Mukhiya post and this resulted into animosity with those who were also eyeing for the said post. In the morning, as he attended the nature's call and she was there to help him in cleaning his hand, named accused surrounded and opened fire causing his death. Once they were convinced that he is no more, they left the place. This followed the FIR.

4. The investigation progressed and paragraph 32, 38,



54 and 60 of the case diary records that the case took the Police to the door of the informant herself and it was found that she along with her foster son-in-law, Sawan Nishad under conspiracy with the accused persons including this petitioner, killed her husband.

5. So far as this petitioner is concerned, the call record in paragraph 38 of the case diary clearly shows that he was in regular touch with the son-in-law, Sawan Nishad and the death took place around 05.00 in the morning whereas the last conversation with this petitioner is at 03.13.24 and the said call lasted for 178 seconds.

6. Though learned counsel for the petitioner submits that those who have been arrested have confessed to the crime before the Police, save and except that he has been made a conspirator, the role of firing has not been assigned to the petitioner.

7. Learned APP for the State, on the other hand, opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail submitting that the different paragraphs of the case diary clearly show that all the accused persons including the petitioner conspired and killed the husband of the informant who herself is in jail. The last call record clearly shows that he was completely aware of the



incident that is going to happen.

8. Having taken the entire facts on record and after hearing the parties, this Court records that the petitioner does not deserve relief.

9. The anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

10. However, if the petitioner surrenders within four weeks from today, the Court concerned shall take up the matter and dispose it of at an earliest.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Vijay Singh/-

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

