IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69174 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010994622026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-373 Year-2026 Thana- BAKHTIYARPUR District- Patna

==========

Pintu Kumar Son of Sohavan Singh @ Suhavan Singh Resident of Village - Mogalpura Bigha, P.S.- Bakhtiyarpur, District - Patna.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Surendra Kumar Singh, Sr. Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Nirmala Kumari, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Manoj Kumar Pandey, Advocate

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

3 30-10-2026 Heard learned Senior Advocate for the petitioner, learned Advocate for the informant and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Bakhtiyarpur P.S. Case No.373 of 2026 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 109, 61(2), 352, 351(2), 351(3) of the BNS & Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Allegedly on the given date and time of occurrence, while the informant was carrying out construction work, the same was objected to by the petitioner and other accused persons, who also extended threats to eliminate the informant

WEB COPY

and his family members. It is further alleged that, on 29.05.2026, at about 2:30 P.M., upon the exhortation of co-accused Sohavan Singh, the petitioner arrived at the informant's godown and enquired about the whereabouts of Informant. When the wife of the informant disclosed that he was not present at the place, the petitioner allegedly fired a shot at her, which struck her in the chest.

4. Learned Senior Advocate appearing for the petitioner submitted that, upon a bare perusal of the F.I.R., the genesis of the occurrence appears to be a land dispute, and therefore, the possibility of false implication of the petitioner cannot be ruled out. Referring to the contents of the F.I.R., it is further contended that the timing of the institution of the case is rather surprising, inasmuch as the alleged occurrence took place at about 2:30 P.M., whereas information was furnished at the police station at 3:15 P.M., i.e., within a span of just 45 minutes. It is further submitted that, as per the F.I.R. itself, upon sustaining the firearm injury, the wife of the informant was initially taken to P.M.C.H. Patna for treatment and was thereafter shifted to a private hospital. In such circumstances, learned Senior Advocate questioned the plausibility of the prosecution version regarding the furnishing of information to

WEB COPY

the police within such a short span of time. It is fairly submitted that the petitioner is carrying two criminal antecedents; however, he is stated to be on bail in both the cases.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State as well as learned Advocate appearing for the informant vehemently oppose the prayer for anticipatory bail and submit that the allegation of firing upon the informant's wife is not confined merely to the version of the informant in the F.I.R. It is further submitted that the statement of the injured was recorded during the course of investigation, wherein she has categorically stated that, it is the petitioner, who had fired upon her, due to which she sustained injury.

6. Having considered the rival submissions advanced by learned Advocates for the respective parties, and taking notes of the materials available on record, particularly the specific allegation against the petitioner of having fired a shot which struck the chest of the informant's wife, as also the statement of the injured recorded during the course of investigation corroborating the said allegation, coupled with the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, as disclosed in paragraph No. 3 of the bail application, this Court is not inclined to accede to the prayer for anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Harish Kumar, J)

Utkarsh.k/-

U		T	

WEB COPY