

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44391 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-92 Year-2014 Thana- BELAGANJ District- Gaya

=====

Rohit Kumar @ Rahul S/O Kamlesh Sharma R/O Vill.- Silaunja, P.S.-
Belaganj, Dist.- Gaya JI

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shivendra Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Renu Kumari,APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 23-07-2026 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 offence punishable under Sections 25(1-b)a,
26, 35 of the Arms Act and ³/₄ Explosive Act.

3.The SHO of the case in compliance of the order
dated 22.07.2026 is present in the Court as Investigating Officer
could not come on account of illness.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case, it is next submitted that
informant alleges that Sohan medical-cum-Vasudha Kendra was
raided on 05.07.2014 in presence of Dr. Sarita and Madhuri and
5-6 bags containing rice was found, further on opening the bag
three countrymade bombs along with a countrymade pistol and



live cartridges were recovered and the owner Sohan disclosed that petitioner had come 15-20 minutes back and had kept a bag saying that he has to go to the block office for getting his domicile certificate for applying in the Army.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case based on the disclosure made by the owner of Sohan Medical Hall-cum-Vasudha Kendra, it is next submitted that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that country-made bomb, pistol along with cartridges was recovered from the premise of the aforesaid Medical Hall-cum-Vasudha Kendra, but then petitioner came to be implicated only for the reason that owner of the said premise disclosed that it was petitioner who had kept the aforesaid seized articles, it is also submitted that the aforesaid Vasudha Kendra previously was being run by the petitioner, but then his license was cancelled and the Vasudha Kendra was allotted in the name of the owners who were running the same when the FIR came to be instituted, it is thus submitted that a dispute had arisen in between the petitioner and the owner of the Vasudha Kendra which led to the implication of the petitioner in the instant false case.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes



the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

7. On query of the Court from the Investigating Officer of the case that as to what transpired during the course of investigation connecting the petitioner with the offence, the Investigating Officer submitted that earlier the Vasudha Kendra was being run by the petitioner, but then he got implicated in a case relating to fake currency thus was sent to judicial custody, as such, the license was allotted in the name of the owners during whose time the aforesaid country-made bomb along with pistol and cartridges were recovered, it is further submitted that the owners of the premise were arrested and sent to judicial custody, but then the case was investigated threadbare and it transpired that on account of the dispute which had arisen in between petitioner and the owners of the aforesaid premise, the petitioner deliberately concealed the aforesaid articles, it is also submitted that even witnesses have supported the case of the prosecution, it is next submitted that case is of year 2014 and the petitioner till date is evading the law.

8. Learned A.P.P. for the State submits that petitioner was earlier implicated in a case relating to fake currency and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted the petitioner may abscond try to tamper with the evidence.



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

10. The personal appearance of the Investigating Officer of the case is dispensed with.

11. This application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

