

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78043 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-125 Year-2025 Thana- MUNGER MUFFASIL District- Munger

Dilkhush Kumar S/O Bijo Yadav @ Bijay Kumar Yadav R/O Village- Taufir
(Taufir), (Toufir), P.S- Muffasil, Distt.- Munger.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sandip Kumar Gautam

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ahmad Ali

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 05-01-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in Munger Muffasil P. S. Case No.125 of 2025 registered
for the offences punishable under Sections 111(1),111(2)
(b),111(4),3(5) of the B.N.S and Sections 25(1)(a),25(1-
A),25(1-AA),25(1-B)(a),25(1-B)(c),26(1),26(2),35 of the Arms
Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant
alleges that on secret information that accused are
manufacturing illegal weapon, the place of occurrence was
raided and three accused were arrested who disclosed their
name as Md. Naushad, Md. Sajmul and Md. Naushad and also



disclosed the name of petitioner and four others who fled from place of occurrence. The apprehended accused also disclosed that Md. Jasim and Md. Shamshad while fleeing left their mobile and on search, illegal weapon and parts were recovered as detailed in the FIR.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was not arrested from the spot as such nothing was recovered from his conscious possession and he came to be implicated in the instant case based on confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody, which does not have any evidentiary value. It is further submitted that petitioner has antecedent of one case, but then, the same is not under the Arms Act.

5. Learned A.P.P. vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that informant alleges that on receiving secret information that arms are being manufactured, the place of occurrence was raided from where some accused fled and three were apprehended who disclosed their name of the petitioner along with others and from the place of occurrence arms and ammunitions were recovered apart from other things as detailed in the FIR. It is also submitted that investigation is in its nascent stage and if privilege of



anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

