IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67760 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010983642026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-121 Year-2026 Thana- BIBHUTIPUR District- Samastipur

==========

Krishna Kumar Jha Son of Late Ram Pukar Jha Resident of Village- Mustafapur, P.S.- Bibhutipur, District- Samastipur.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mahendra Pratap, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Dr. Mrityunjaya Kr. Gautam, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRAVEEN KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

3 18-11-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Bibhutipur P.S. Case No. 121 of 2026 dated 22.03.2026 registered for the offences punishable under Section 329(4), 126(2), 115(2), 109(1), 74, 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. As per the allegation, when the informant was sitting at his doorstep, then all the FIR accused persons including the petitioner came on a motorcycle armed with iron rods and *lathi*, whereafter they began assaulting him. It has further been alleged that this petitioner specifically assaulted on the head of the informant by means of iron rod, while co-

WEB COPY

accused Shravan Kumar assaulted by means of *lathi* on his leg, while this petitioner and co-accused Harshvardhan Jha caught hair of the daughter-in-law of the informant and also started assaulting, while co-accused Shravan Kumar assaulted the son of the informant by means of *lathi*

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. Moreover, the informant has filed three other cases against the petitioner with an oblique motive and the injury report does not support the allegations levelled. It has further been submitted that one injury report of the same informant is being used in both the cases filed against the petitioner. It has further been submitted that there is serious dispute between the parties, which is reflected in the FIR itself. It has lastly been submitted that there is false accusation against the petitioner and the petitioner deserves anticipatory bail.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. Heard the parties and perused the record.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that there is specific allegation against the petitioner to have assaulted the informant on the head by means of iron

WEB COPY

rod, the injury report of the informant goes to show that he received a hair line fracture on the head, which was opined to be grievous in nature, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and the same is hereby rejected.

8. The application stands rejected.

(Praveen Kumar, J)

Aarti/-

U		T	

WEB COPY