

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.37914 of 2026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-19 Year-2026 Thana- SHRIKRISHNAPURI District- Patna

Ratan Tara Prakash @ Ratan Tara Son of Raj Kumar @ Raj Kumar Singh  
Resident of L -147 Sri Krishna Puri, P.S.- Sri Krishna Puri, Distt.- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                            |                             |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s :     | Mr.Radha Mohan Singh, Adv   |
| For the Opposite Party/s : | Mr.Nand Kishore Prasad, APP |
|                            | Mr. Uma Shankar, Adv        |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

- 3      06-07-2026      1.    Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2.    The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Sri Krishna Puri (S.K Puri) PS Case No. 19 of 2026, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 118, 126(2), 127(2), 303(2), 115(2), 109, 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
3.    The Investigating Officer of the case, in compliance of the order dated 23-6-2026, is present in the court.
4.    Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that his son (Mehul) was playing badminton, where



petitioner was also playing and petitioner started taunting Mehul, on objection petitioner assaulted him by an iron rod causing injury and thereafter snatched his chain and fled towards his home saying that call your father, he will also be shot, thereafter Mehul also went behind the petitioner, but petitioner had fled on his terrace, as such Mehul came back and informed his father that petitioner assaulted him and even snatched his chain, as such the informant along with his son went to the house of the petitioner, where from before 15 accused persons were present, who started assaulting them and the assault was committed by petitioner, Utkarsh, Niskarsh, Sudha, Raj Kumar and ten unknown students of coaching institute, further Raj Kumar Singh came with a rifle and assaulted his son by butt of rifle on face causing injury, further the informant somehow managed to pick his son and brought him to the hospital, where his treatment started.

5. Learned counsel for 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 allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant who is father of Mehul alleges that while playing badminton, petitioner was taunting Mehul on account of which



an altercation took place and petitioner assaulted him by an iron rod causing injury and even snatched his chain, thereafter Mehul went to the house of petitioner, but since petitioner had gone on his terrace, as such Mehul came back and informed about the occurrence to his father and when they went to house of the petitioner, where they were assaulted brutally. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that though it is alleged that informant and his son were brutally assaulted by the accused persons but then allegation of assault is not specific rather is general and omnibus in nature. It is also submitted that had petitioner assaulted Mehul in the manner as alleged in the first part of the occurrence, in that event, it was not possible for Mehul to go to the house of the petitioner.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that a counter-affidavit has been filed and from perusal of the pleadings and the photographs annexed with the counter-affidavit, it would manifest that Mehul was brutally assaulted on account of which he was admitted initially at Sahyog Hospital, thereafter in the hospital of Dr.



Rohatogi and then AIIMS, Patna. It is further submitted that doctor at AIIMS had opined that in the event if the pain in the spine does not subside, the same will require surgical intervention which amply demonstrates the nature of injury. It is also submitted no doubt allegation of assault is not specific but then the informant specifically alleges that petitioner on account of dispute, which had arisen during playing of badminton, had assaulted Mehul and when Mehul along with informant went to the house of the petitioner to complain about the occurrence to his family members, they were also assaulted; and in the assault, it is specifically alleged that petitioner was also involved. It is submitted that the entire occurrence took place on account of dispute which had arisen in between Mehul and the petitioner. It is next submitted that if father of Mehul had accompanied him to the house of the petitioner, in that event, the petitioner ought to have respected the informant, but then instead of showing respect to father of his colleague, assault was resorted to. It is further submitted that from perusal of the photographs annexed with the counter-affidavit, it would manifest that Mehul has suffered injury and the injury has been opined to be grievous in nature. It is also submitted that merely because specific allegation of assault is not alleged that in itself cannot be a



ground for grant of anticipatory bail without appreciating the nature of injury suffered by the injured.

7. The Investigating Officer of the case, who is present in the court, also submits that during the course of investigation, witnesses have supported the case of prosecution and the injury suffered by the injured has been opined to be grievous in nature.

8. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that Utkarsh Raj, brother of the petitioner, who is also an accused in the instant case, had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc No. 24371 of 2026 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 7-5-2026 passed by a learned co-ordinate bench, as such based on parity, the anticipatory bail is prayed for, on which learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant reiterates and submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that thrust of the allegation is against the petitioner and not against his brother, Utkarsh Raj, who has been granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

9. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submission made by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not



inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

11. The personal appearance of the Investigating Officer of the case is dispensed with.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

