

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44368 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-194 Year-2021 Thana- TARARI District- Bhojpur

Rajendra Ram S/o Pancham Ram R/o Village - Jethwar, P.S - Tarari, District - Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Prabhat Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 21-07-2026 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 341, 323, 307, 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the informant alleges that his son and nephew on 30.10.2021 at 6 A.M. were coming back home when five named accused persons including the petitioner abused and assaulted.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of 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 allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that no specific allegation of assault is alleged against the



petitioner.

5. Learned A.P.P., Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the order impugned, it would manifest that petitioner had earlier filed A.B.P. No. 3207 of 2021 before the learned District Court and the same came to be rejected by an order dated 30.06.2022, and it appears that thereafter petitioner did not move before this Court nor surrendered, rather again filed the instant A.B.P. No. 1192 of 2026 after four years which came to be rejected by an order dated 25.05.2026, which amply demonstrates the conduct of the petitioner, it is further submitted that if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond as he has antecedent of two cases.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikram/-

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

