

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36959 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-142 Year-2022 Thana- PATEPUR District- Vaishali

Munilal Ram @ Munnilal Ram S/O Ramdev Ram R/O Village- Dih Buchauli,
P.S.- Jandaha, Distt.- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shanti Bhushan Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Syed Mojibur Rahman

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 Patepur P.S. Case No.142 of 2022, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 506 of the
Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of nine cases
and the informant alleges that 8 named accused persons
including the petitioner along with 20 unknown accused came to
his house and on orders of Kiran Devi, Amarjeet, Lalbabu
Sahni, Arvind and Rakesh started firing and rest accused pelted
stones and threw bomb, accordingly, the police was informed
and from the place of occurrence, empty cartridges were



recovered.

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 from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that on orders of Kiran Devi, Amarjeet, Lalbabu Sahni, Arvind and Rakesh are alleged to have fired but then in the firing also no one was injured and as far as petitioner is concerned, there is no specific allegation against him rather allegation of throwing bomb and pelting stones is general and omnibus in nature.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the case is of the year 2022 and from perusal of para-3 to the anticipatory bail application, it would manifest that petitioner has antecedent of nine cases, which also includes UAPA Act, CCA Act, Explosives Substance Act etc. It is further submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond as petitioner has approached this court after four years of the institution of the instant FIR.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submissions made by the learned APP, 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	
---	--	---	--

