

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44445 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-96 Year-2026 Thana- SAHEBPUR KAMAL District- Begusarai

Kunal Kumar @ Kunal Singh S/o Sanjay Singh R/o Village - Bishunpur
Ahok, P.S. - S. Kamal, Dist. - Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Krishna Chandra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Navin Kumar Pandey, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 22-07-2026 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 126(2), 115(2), 127(2), 109, 288, 351(3), 352, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and 27 of the Arms Act.

3.Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of four cases and the informant alleges that he along with his nephew on 14.04.2026 at 09:05 PM were watching a match at Bajrangbali crossing, when accused persons including the petitioner came along with an accused and abused and assaulted his nephew, on objection, Bhushan fired but missed, further Raushan and Sanjay surrounded his nephew and petitioner along with other accused assaulted his nephew by



butt of pistol repeated causing injury on head.

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 though it is alleged that petitioner assaulted the nephew of the informant repeatedly by butt of pistol, but then the injury is not recorded in the order impugned rather the order impugned records medical prescription of the injured also available on record, it is further submitted that sister of petitioner married the younger brother of the injured, as such, a dispute had arisen hence the informant who is uncle of the injured falsely implicated the petitioner in the instant case.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner submits that criminal case cuts both ways, it is also submitted that if a dispute had arisen on account of marriage of the younger brother of the injured with the sister of the petitioner, that may be a reason for committing the occurrence, it is also submitted that petitioner has antecedent of four cases including a case under NDPS Act and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence.

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. This application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

