

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64113 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-212 Year-2023 Thana- MAHESHKHUNT District- Khagaria

1. Amarjeet Singh @ Amarjit Singh @ Nippo Singh @ Nipo Singh son of Rajeev Singh RO Village -Patla Ward No 16 PS -Maheshkhut District -Khagaria
2. Bittu Singh @ Nilesh singh @ Nilesh Kumar @ Bittu Kumar son of Rajeev Singh RO Village -Patla Ward No 16 PS -Maheshkhut District -Khagaria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anirudh Kumar Sinha  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ram Sumiran Rai

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

2      10-02-2026                      1.      Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2.      The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Maheshkhut P.S. Case No. 212 of 2023, registered for the offences punishable under Sections Sections 302, 286, 504/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3.      Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that the accused persons came variously armed and Gopal Singh and his wife, Mamta, gave orders to kill, on which Gopal, Prittam, Sahil, Amarjeet, Bittu, Aman, Paramjeet and Rajeev started firing indiscriminately, further gunshot fired by



Gopal hit his father on his chest, then firing made by other accused also hit his father on his body and his father died.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant specifically alleges that it was Gopal who fired causing fire-arm injury on chest of his father and thereafter other accused also fired causing fire-arm injury on his body, but then it is submitted that allegation of firing against other accused persons including the petitioners except Gopal is general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that informant's and petitioners' sides are on litigating terms.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that father of the informant died. It is further submitted no doubt specific allegation of firing causing fire-arm injury on chest of the father of the informant is against Gopal, but then other accused including the petitioners are also alleged to have fired and father of the informant also received fire-arm injury on other parts of the body apart from chest. It is also submitted that presence of the accused persons at



the place of occurrence embolden Gopal and others including the petitioners to resort to firing leading to death of the father of the informant. It is submitted that investigation in the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

