

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43341 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-111 Year-2026 Thana- MOTIPUR District- Muzaffarpur

Sachin Kumar S/o Suresh Ray R/o Village- Sundersarai, Ward No.12, P.S-
and Dist- Motipur, Dist- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Santosh Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Pushpa Sinha.1, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 16-07-2026 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 Section 103(1) of
the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is young boy
aged about 18 years and the informant alleges that on
16.03.2026 at 2:00 PM, he along with his father on a car were
going to Motipur market and when they reached near
Radhakrishna Temple, they saw an alto car coming from the
opposite direction driven by the petitioner, it is next alleged that
the petitioner for taking side had an altercation with his father
and thereafter the petitioner pulled him out of the car and



assaulted and pushed his father who fell and on account to which he suffered injury on back side of his head and started bleeding from mouth and nose and was taken to hospital where doctors declared him dead.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that the father of the petitioner fell on the ground and thus suffered injury, but then informant for reason best known implicated the petitioner in the case.

5. Learned A.P.P. vehemently for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that it is a case of a road rage for taking side, the petitioner entered into an altercation with the father of the informant leading to the occurrence which ultimately led to his death. It is further submitted that there is a specific allegation in the FIR that petitioner pulled the father of the informant from the car, assaulted him and thereafter he fell on the ground on account to which he received injury on back side of the head and when he was taken to hospital, the doctors declared him dead. It is also submitted that it does not appear probable that informant would falsely implicate someone who was not involved in the death of his father. It is next submitted that investigation in the case is



continuing.

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

7. Accordingly, the application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

rajesh/-

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

