

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.66526 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-55 Year-2024 Thana- DUMARIYA District- Gaya

=====

Md. Yusuf Ansari S/o Dil Mohammad Miyan R/o Village - Chhota Pankara,
P.S - Dumariya, District - Gaya, Bihar

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Md. Rafique Miyan @ Md. Rafique Ansari S/o Dil Mohammad Miyan R/o Village - Chhota Pankara, P.S - Dumariya, District - Gaya, Bihar (Accused)

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Md Jubair Ansari, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary, APP
For the Opp. Party No.2	:	Mr. Sumit Kumar Singh, Advocate
		Mr. Amit Kumar Singh, Advocate
		Ms. Rinki Kumari, Advocate
		Mr. Ram Kishore Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

- 3 16-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

APP for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party

no.2.

2. This application has been filed for

cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the opposite party

no.2 by a Coordinate Bench of this Court *vide* order dated

18.12.2024 passed in Criminal Miscellaneous No.87079 of

2024, in connection with Dumariya P.S. Case No.55 of 2024

registered for the offence under sections 109, 115(2), 118 and

126 of the B.N.S., 2023.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has prayed for cancellation of bail granted to the opposite party no.2 on the ground that the injury report was suppressed by the opposite party no.2.

4. Learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 has submitted that at the time of passing of impugned order the injury report was there and after considering the same, the bail was granted to the opposite party no.2 by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court and therefore, this Court may not interfere with the impugned order.

5. I have considered the submissions of the parties. This Court is not inclined to go into the disputed questions of fact after more than one and half years of granting bail to the opposite party no.2 as there is no allegation of tampering with the evidence or threatening the petitioner.

6. In view of the above, I do not find any illegality or infirmity in the impugned order granting bail to the opposite party no.2. Accordingly, this application is rejected. However, the trial court is directed to conclude the trial as early as possible.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made herein are limited to the adjudication of the present



application and this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Pawan/ Shalini

U			
---	--	--	--

