

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48605 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-77 Year-2025 Thana- RAHUI District- Nalanda

Ranjeet Kumar @ Ranju Kumar S/o Ashok Prasad Resident of Village-
Toofanganj, PS- Rahui (Bhaganbigha), District- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Arvind Kumar Mahuar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh, APP
For the Informant/s	:	Mr. Navjot Yeshu, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

6 21-01-2026 Heard Mr. Arvind Kumar Mahuar, learned Advocate

for the petitioner and Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh, learned

APP for the State. The informant is represented through Mr.

Navjot Yeshu, learned Advocate.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Rahui (Bhaganbigha) P.S. Case No.77 of 2025 registered
for the offences punishable under Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3),
126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109, 352 of the BNS and Section 27 of
the Arms Act.

3. Allegedly, in the night of the fateful day, while the
informant was going to Bihar Sharif, in the meanwhile, seven
named accused persons, including the petitioner surrounded him
and started abusing him. It is specifically alleged that the



petitioner fired upon him, due to which he sustained injury on his head.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner, taking this Court through the FIR, has contended that the alleged occurrence took place on 05.02.2025 at 10:10 P.M. and the *fardbeyan* of the informant was recorded on the same day at 10:43 P.M., which *prima facie* shows that the informant was in a good mental and physical condition to make his *fardbeyan*. The entire prosecution case falls to the ground for the simple reason that the nature of injury is not only said to be simple, but the doctor opined that it may be a firearm injury. During the course of investigation, it has also come that there was land dispute between the parties and, as such, the false implication of the petitioner cannot be ruled out. It has also been submitted that the petitioner has been working as Station Master and posted at Gauchhari Station and the police has not verified this fact as to whether on the date of occurrence he was on duty or not.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State and the learned Advocate for the informant opposed the bail application and submitted that besides the specific accusation of causing firearm injury over the head of the informant, which is a vital part, the injury report clearly suggests that a blackish



brown lacerated wound over right-side forehead of size approx, 2”x½” x skin deep with totting present around wound and undoubtedly it is a firearm injury. Moreover the petitioner also bears two criminal antecedents, which fortified his criminal activity. The plea of alibi is good for the trial and not for the anticipatory bail, which is an extraordinary relief, is the contention of the learned Advocate for the informant.

6. Having considered the submissions advanced by the learned Advocate for the respective parties and taking note of the specific accusation of causing firearm injury over the head, though the injury is simple, but it cannot be ruled out that the informant was fortunate enough, besides the two criminal antecedents of the petitioner, this Court is not acceded to the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. Accordingly, his prayer is rejected.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

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

