

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36976 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-692 Year-2025 Thana- HARSIDHI District- East Champaran

Ankit Kumar @ Ankit Raj S/o Jagat Prasad Resident of Village - Govindapur,
P.S.- Harsidhi, District - East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Suraj Kumar Tiwari

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Harsidhi P.S. Case No.692 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 117(2), 126(2), 109, 303(2), 351(2), 352 and 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges that accused persons came to her house and Jagat assaulted her husband repeatedly by knife causing injury on head and petitioner assaulted by *mungadi* causing fracture of hand and also assaulted her, while Radha snatched her silver chain.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in



the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that even presuming what has been alleged is true without admitting then allegation of assaulting the husband of the informant by knife is against Jagat and as far as this petitioner is concerned, he is alleged to have assaulted the husband of the informant by *mungadi* on hand, which is not a vital part of the body. It is further submitted that the instant FIR has been instituted on 12.10.2025 at 9.30 A.M. It is further submitted that specific pleading has been made at Para-16 of the anticipatory bail application, wherein it has been pleaded that one Amir Chandra Prasad instituted Harsidhi P.S. Case No.704 of 2025 dated 16.10.2025 with respect to an occurrence which was committed on 11.10.2025 at 7.30 A.M., in which petitioner is also an accused. It is next submitted that in the instant FIR also, the occurrence is alleged to have been committed on 11.10.2025 at 8 A.M. and the place of occurrence in both the FIR is different, thus it is submitted that the petitioner could not have been present at both place of occurrence at the same time.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that no doubt a pleading has been made at Para-16 that Harsidhi P.S. Case No.704 of 2025 has been instituted by one Amir Chandra



Prasad with respect to an occurrence committed on 11.10.2025 at 7.30 A.M. on 16.10.2025 but then the FIR has not been annexed with the anticipatory bail application. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that in Harsidhi P.S. Case No.704 of 2025, Jagat is not alleged to have assaulted by knife and as far as present petitioner is concerned, against him, it is alleged that he assaulted the informant of Harsidhi P.S. Case No.704 of 2025 by *mungadi* on his back, on which the learned APP submits that this might be a ploy of the petitioner to get an FIR instituted subsequently with an intent to create an alibi. It is further submitted that no doubt petitioner in the instant case is alleged to have assaulted the informant by *mungadi* on hand but then the hand got fractured and the injury has been opined to be grievous in nature.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

