

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39893 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-92 Year-2026 Thana- KATEYA District- Gopalganj

Abhishek Dubey S/o Pujari Dubey Resident of Village - Raipura, P.S. -
Kateya, District - Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pankaj Kumar Dubey, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 29-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2),
115(2), 118(1), 109(1), 351(3) and 352 of the BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of six cases and the informant alleges
that Ripu and Pujari caught the informant and petitioner
assaulted by knife repeatedly causing injury on various parts of
the body.

4. 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 order
impugned, it would manifest that the injury report was not
produced despite order of the learned District Court, as such, the
learned District Court directed for initiating a departmental



proceeding against the Investigating Officer of the case.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and submits that there is a specific allegation against this petitioner of stabbing the informant repeatedly causing injury on various parts of the body. It is next submitted that from perusal of the pleadings made in the anticipatory bail application, it would manifest that petitioner has not even denied the said allegation that he had not assaulted by knife. It is also submitted that petitioner has antecedent of six cases and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and also taking into consideration the criminal antecedent of the petitioner, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

