

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39956 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-319 Year-2025 Thana- PAROO District- Muzaffarpur

Mithun Kumar @ Sandeep Kumar S/O Ravindra Sahni Resident of Village-
Kamalpura, P.S.- Paroo, Dist- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sumit Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shailendra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 30-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 303(2), 352, 351(2), 351(3), 3(5)
of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is a young
boy aged about 20 years and the informant alleges that on
17.06.2025, he along with his co-villager Raju were coming
back home at 2.00 P.M. by motorcycle when they were
intercepted by five named accused persons including the
petitioner, who snatched the key of the motorcycle along with
Rs.12,000/- and a mobile and assaulted Raju by butt of pistol



causing injury. On alarm, villagers gathered when accused fled leaving one of their motorcycle and even fired.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that petitioner and the informant are co-villagers, as such, it does not appear probable that petitioner along with other accused persons would have intercepted the informant and his friend with an intent to commit loot. It is next submitted that a dispute had arisen while playing cricket on account of which, an altercation took place in which both sides assaulted each other. It is also submitted that though allegation of firing is alleged and the case has been instituted under the Arms Act, but then no one was injured nor any empty cartridges were recovered from the place of occurrence. It is further submitted that if in the nature of allegation as alleged in the FIR, the petitioner is sent to judicial custody, his entire career would get jeopardized and chances are bright that he may come in contact with hardened criminals. It is further submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove his innocence.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail



application.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Paroo P. S. Case No.319 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S. with a further condition that one of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his father, namely, Ravindra Sahni.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

