IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.76592 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC011109172026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-279 Year-2025 Thana- Mufassil District- Purnia

==========

Vidyanand Thakur S/o Yogendra Thakur R/o Village- Mahendrapur, Ward No.9, P.S- Muffasil, Distt.- Purnea, Bihar.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bidhu Ranjan, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Damodar Prasad Tiwary, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

2 05-11-2026 **1.** Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State, Sri Damodar Prasad Tiwary.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 279 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109(1), 303(2), 324(4), 76, 352 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and in sum and substance the allegation is that petitioner assaulted the informant by an iron rod causing injury over his eyebrow.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the

WEB COPY

informant. It is next submitted that petitioner and the side of the informant are agnates and are having dispute relating to property. It is further submitted that from side of the petitioner, Muffasil PS Case No. 280 of 2025 has been instituted against the informant and his side. It is also submitted that on account of dispute relating to property, an altercation had taken place in which both sides assaulted each other.

5. On query of the Court from the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that whether petitioner also suffered any injury, and if yes, what kind of injury, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner fairly submits that petitioner suffered injury, but the injury has been opined to be simple in nature.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State, Sri Damodar Prasad Tiwary, opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of order impugned, it would manifest that the injury suffered by the informant has been opined to be grievous in nature and is on vital part of the body. It is thus submitted that if any dispute arises in between the agnates and fight takes place, in that event, the assault should not be such which becomes dangerous for life.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties

WEB COPY

and taking into consideration the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

U		T	

WEB COPY