

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.50371 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-48 Year-2025 Thana- MOHANPUR District- Samastipur

Rajeev Ray @ Rajeev Kumar Ray Son of Mahesh Ray Village -Dumari  
Dakshini PS -Mohanpur, Dist- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amit Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Raj Ballabh Singh

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      09-02-2026                      1. Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh, learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Mohanpur P.S. Case No.48/2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(2), 109, 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant at the outset submits that Manjit Kumar @ Manjit Ray had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.45413/2025 and the same came to be rejected by an order dated 15.11.2025. Further, Sujit Kumar @ Sujit Ray had also approached this Court by filing Cr. Misc. No.42416/2025 and the same also came to be rejected by an order dated 09.07.2025 by a learned Co-ordinate Bench. It is



next submitted that the FIR was instituted against five named accused persons including the present petitioner with an allegation that accused persons opened fire against the informant when he was hit by a bullet on his stomach and when informant's co-villager came to rescue him, he was also fired at causing firearm injury. It is further submitted that the case of the petitioner if not akin is similar to the case of aforesaid accused persons whose anticipatory bail applications have been rejected.

4. Learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner argued vehemently but then is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant that two persons were injured by firearm and petitioner is alleged to have participated in the occurrence also.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

amit/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

