

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.45387 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-34 Year-2026 Thana- CHARPOKHARI District- Bhojpur

Ranjan Kumar S/O Brijnandan Singh Resident of Village - Kanai, Police
Station - Charpokhari , District - Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Akash Kumar Mishra, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 14-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad,.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 109 and 3(5) of the BNS as well as Section 27 of the Arms Act.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges that on 25.02.2026 at 7:00 p.m. he was going to attend a marriage ceremony on his motorcycle and when he reached near Panchayat Bhawan, three unknown accused came and the accused sitting in the middle of the motorcycle fired causing firearm injury on his neck and he fell and could not identify the accused and thereafter informed his friend Yashwant regarding the occurrence, further police came and he was admitted in a



hospital.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the FIR was against unknown, it is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant alleges that he was shot by a person sitting in the middle of the motorcycle but he could not identify the accused persons which amply demonstrates that the accused who committed the occurrence were not identified by the informant, but then it is submitted that on 27.02.2026 the re-statement of the informant was recorded by the police and he disclosed the name of the accused persons including the petitioner and also disclosed that out of fear initially at the time of instituting the FIR he did not disclose the name of the petitioner which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution as statement before police is not admissible in evidence also. It is also submitted that even presuming what has been stated by the informant in his subsequent statement to be true then it was Akhilesh who is alleged to have fired causing firearm injury on his neck.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State, vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands, admitted is that informant



was shot leading to injury on his neck, it is further submitted that it might be a possibility that at the time of instituting the FIR he may not be remembering the name of the accused persons or out of fear did not disclose their name but subsequently when statement of the victim was recorded he disclosed the name of the accused persons including the petitioner, it is also submitted that it does not appear probable that informant who was shot in his neck would try to falsely implicate someone who was not involved in the occurrence, it is further submitted though petitioner is not alleged to have fired but then his presence at the place of occurrence along with Akhilesh and other accused emboldened Akhilesh to commit the occurrence of firing. It is further submitted that investigation is still continuing and petitioner has antecedent of one case.

6. Considering 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	
---	--	---	--

