

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36892 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-308 Year-2025 Thana- BARACHATTI District- Gaya

Ajay Paswan @ Ajay Kumar Son of Bhuneshwar Paswan Resident of Village-
Gajragadh, P.S.- Barachatti, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vijay Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Raj Kishor Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 15-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Barachatti PS Case No. 308 of 2025, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 76,
303(2), 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the informant alleges
that on 6-9-2025 at 4 pm, the accused persons including the
petitioner came variously armed and said to vacate the land,
further Anshu assaulted Sipu Kumari by an iron rod on chest on
account of which she became unconscious and petitioner
assaulted pregnant daughter of the informant, namely, Sangeeta
by danda on stomach and accused took away jewellery worth
Rs. 2 lakh.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant on account of dispute relating to land. It is also submitted that specific allegation of assaulting by rod on chest of Sipu Kumari is against Anshu and petitioner is alleged to have assaulted the daughter of the informant by lathi on stomach but then the injury has been opined to be simple in nature.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that informant specifically alleges that his daughter was pregnant and the petitioner is alleged to have assaulted a pregnant lady by lathi on stomach causing injury that in itself is a ground enough not to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and petitioner has antecedent of two cases even.

6. Considering the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

