

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36881 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-206 Year-2025 Thana- KUMAR KHAND District- Madhepura

Ravi Thakur @ Ravi Kumar @ Sanoj S/o Deep Narayan Takur R/o vill -
Gadhiya, Ward No. 10, P.S.- Kumarkhand, Distt.- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Amarnath Jha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, A.P.P.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Sharda Nand Mishra, Advocate
		Ms. Isha Mishra, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 15-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 118(2), 117(2), 303(2), 351(2) and 352 of the BNS and subsequently Section 109 of the BNS has been added.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on account of dispute relating to boundaries of the land, the accused persons came on 03.09.2025 at 02:00 p.m. and Vijay assaulted him by sword repeatedly on his head causing injury and petitioner assaulted the informant by an iron rod



causing injury on right arm. Further, accused were able to assault the informant since he is differently abled person.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that on account of dispute relating to land, the occurrence is alleged to have taken place. It is next submitted that specific allegation of assaulting the informant repeatedly by sword is against Vijay and as far as petitioner is concerned, he is alleged to have assaulted the informant by an iron rod causing injury on hand which is not a vital part of the body.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submit that informant is a differently abled person and even if there was a dispute relating to land the accused ought not to have assaulted the informant with such force which caused grievous injury. It is further submitted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant that from perusal of the case diary, it would manifest that informant suffered three injuries, one on head and two on hand and all the injuries have



been opined to be grievous in nature which amply demonstrates that brute force was used while assaulting the informant.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Kumarkhand P.S. Case No. 206 of 2025 pending in the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-III, Madhepura/Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

