IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74683 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC011052652026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-319 Year-2025 Thana- PAROO District- Muzaffarpur

==========

Prince Kumar Son of Dineshwar Sahni @ Dineshwar Sahani Resident of Mohalla- Pashchim Tola, Kamapura, P.S.- Paroo, District- Muzaffarpur (Bihar). ... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar ... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Akash Kumar Mishra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Bhanu Pratap Singh, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

2 23-11-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 303(2), 352, 351(2), 351(3), 3(5) of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is a young boy aged about 21 years and the informant alleges that on 17.06.2025, he along with his co-villager Raju were coming back home at 2.00 P.M. by motorcycle when they were intercepted by five named accused persons including the petitioner, who snatched the key of the motorcycle along with Rs.12,000/- and a mobile and assaulted Raju by butt of pistol

WEB COPY

causing injury. On alarm, villagers gathered when accused fled leaving one of their motorcycle and even fired.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that petitioner and the informant are co-villagers, as such, it does not appear probable that petitioner along with other accused persons would have intercepted the informant and his friend with an intent to commit loot. It is next submitted that a dispute had arisen while playing cricket on account of which, an altercation took place in which both sides assaulted each other. It is also submitted that though allegation of firing is alleged and the case has been instituted under the Arms Act, but then no one was injured nor any empty cartridges were recovered from the place of occurrence. It is further submitted that if in the nature of allegation as alleged in the FIR, the petitioner is sent to judicial custody, his entire career would get jeopardized and chances are bright that he may come in contact with hardened criminals. It is further submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove his innocence. It is further submitted that similarly situated co-accused, namely, Mithun Kumar @

WEB COPY

Sandeep Kumar has already been extended the privilege of bail vide order dated 30.06.2026 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 39956 of 2026.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Paroo P. S. Case No.319 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S. with a further condition that one of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his father, namely, Dineshwar Sahni @ Dineshwar Sahani.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Jagdish/-

U		T	

WEB COPY