

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.45961 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-346 Year-2026 Thana- GAYA MUFASIL District- Gaya

1. Lallu Sao @ Lallu Saw @ Lal Saav S/O Late Gariban Saw @ Gariban Sao Resident of Mohalla- Manpur Gere Road, Krishna Puri Colony, P.S- Mufassil, Disrict-Gaya ji.
2. Navin Kumar S/O Lallu Sao @ Lallu Saw @ Lal Saav Resident of Mohalla- Manpur Gere Road, Krishna Puri Colony, P.S- Mufassil, District-Gaya ji.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Sharda Nand Mishra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Md. Ataur Rahman, APP
For the Informant :	Mr. Saroj Kumar Sharma, Advocate
	Mr. Vikash Kumar, Advocate
	Mr. Sunny Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RANJAN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

2 21-07-2026 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners and learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the State.

2. At the outset, it is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that during pendency of this case, petitioner no. 2, namely, Navin Kumar has already been arrested, as such, present anticipatory bail application of petitioner no. 2 has become infructuous.

3. Accordingly, the prayer of anticipatory bail application of petitioner no. 2, namely, Navin Kumar stands dismissed as withdrawn having become infructuous.

4. Now, this application survives only for petitioner



no. 1, namely, Lallu Sao @ Lallu Saw @ Lal Saav.

5. The accused/petitioner is named in F.I.R. and apprehending his arrest in connection with Mufassil P.S. Case No. 346 of 2026, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 117(2), 109, 351(2), 3(5) of BNS.

6. The allegation against above named petitioner no. 1 in the FIR is that he assaulted the informant and his son, causing several injuries.

7. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the allegation against petitioner is general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that the injury sustained by the informant on the vital part of his body has been opined to be simple in nature, whereas the grievous injury is on a non-vital part of the body. It is also submitted that the alleged occurrence is merely an exaggerated version of a minor scuffle. On these grounds, learned counsel prays for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Learned APP duly assisted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, while opposing the prayer of bail submitted that there is grievous injuries on both the informant and his son. It is further submitted that, as is evident from the impugned order, the son of the informant sustained



several injuries and he is locomotor disable as he has deformity of both legs allegedly due to the assault committed by the accused.

9. Considering the submissions, in particular, petitioner brutally assaulted the son of petitioner with locomotor disability, this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer of bail of petitioner is rejected.

(Ranjan Kumar Jha, J)

veena/-

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

