

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.66675 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-273 Year-2025 Thana- KUDRA District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

Ajay Paswan S/o Yamuna Paswan R/o Village- Majhiyawa, Khajura, P.S.-
Belauv, District- Bhabhua

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Akanksha Verma, Advocate
	:	Mr. Arvind Kumar Tiwary, Advocate
	:	Mr. Chandra Shekhar Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Bharat Bhushan, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Shivjee Singh, Advocate
	:	Mr. Mukesh Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 11-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP
representing the State as also learned counsel representing the
Informant.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Kudra P.S. Case No. 273 of 2025 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 109(1) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and section 27 of the Arms Act, lodged on 15.06.2025 by the informant Sarita Kumari.

3. As per the prosecution story, the lady who is a Police Constable posted in Supaul on 15.06.2025 at 4:15 AM was going to Kudra Railway Station to take the Bhabhua-Patna Intersity Express on a motorcycle when two person on a



motorcycle opened fire causing injury to her. She made allegation against this petitioner that some loan was taken for which she was threatened with dire consequences a day before incident. The lady was shifted to trauma centre at Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi (Uttar Pradesh). This led to the F.I.R..

4. The contention of the petitioner through learned counsel is that he was not at the place of occurrence nor is the assailant but has been wrongly implicated only because he asked for the return of the loan amount.

5. The matter was earlier heard on 25.09.2025 and considering the insistence of the petitioner that he was not at the place of occurrence whereas the informant case was that he served as a liner, the case diary was called for.

6. Mr. Bharat Bhushan, learned APP representing the State and he has taken this Court to paragraph nos. 9 and 12 of the case diary to show that in the night of 14.06.2025/15.06.2025, the phone number of the petitioner was active from 2:07 AM till 6:43 AM with a particular number including just before the occurrence took place (4:15 AM) inasmuch as his phone was active at 4:12 AM for 77 seconds and 4:23 AM for 266 seconds. The injured is a Police Constable,



the assailant opened fire when she was going on her duty, she alleged the role of the petitioner, the case diary prima facie accept the allegation made by the informant.

7. In that background, it would be appropriate that the petitioner seek bail, the anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

8. Interlocutory Application if any, stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

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

