

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40011 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-110 Year-2025 Thana- ANDHRATHARHI District- Madhubani

Md. Shaukat @ Shaukat Hussain S/o Sardar Hussain R/o Village - Satghara,
Ward No. - 5, P.S - Rajnagar, Dist. - Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jaishankar Kumar Yadav

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Kalyan Shankar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Andhara Thari PS Case No. 110 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Section 103(1) of the Bharatiya
Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of five cases of serious nature and the
informant alleges that he received an information on 24-7-2025
at 2:25 pm that dacoity has been committed at the house of Raj
Kumar, accordingly he reached the place of occurrence and saw
that the house was vandalised and blood was found splattered on
the *varandah*, further Rajesh (son of Raj Kumar) disclosed that
10-12 unknown accused had came and committed dacoity after



locking the family members in a room, further the informant traced the blood stain and found a dead body lying in the field of Raj Kumar, but neither the villager nor Rajesh could identify the dead body as the deceased was a person from outside the village.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the FIR was against unknown and the name of the petitioner transpired during the course of investigation based on confessional statement of Jitender in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that allegation as alleged in the FIR is serious, no doubt name of the petitioner transpired in the case based on confessional statement of Jitender, but then petitioner has antecedent of five serious cases and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence.

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	
---	--	---	--

