

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.79114 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-78 Year-2024 Thana- SAHAR District- Bhojpur

Priyanshu Rai @ Priyanshu Kumar S/O Deepak Ray @ Deepak Rai R/O
Village- Perhap, P.S.- Sahar, Dist.- Bhojpur, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Ravi Shankar Roy, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Raj Kishor Singh, APP
	Mr. Saumya, Adv
	Mr. Suryajit Prakash
	Mr. Avinash Raj
	Mr. Shantam Shivam
	Ms. Alankrita Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 16-02-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of
the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Sahar P.S. Case No. 78 of 2024, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 307, 302, 448, 201,
447 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 25(1-B)a, 26, 27
and 35 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges
that named accused persons including the petitioner entered his
Dalan where he was sitting with his son; and on account of



previous enmity, the accused being agnates fired, on which the informant and his son fled in their house, thereafter, petitioner, Deepak and Sonu fired indiscriminately causing injury to his son, Aditya, thereafter Diwakar, Vishnu, Suman, Parmatma, Nandu and Chhotak along with 3-4 unknown accused also fired at the informant and his son who was lying on the ground while the other accused were watching the occurrence from the window, it is next alleged that his son was declared dead by the doctor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case being agnate. It is next submitted that a property dispute in between the sides of the petitioner and the informant is brewing for a long time. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that this petitioner along with Deepak and Sonu are alleged to have fired causing death of son of the informant, namely, Aditya. It is next submitted that Deepak had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc No. 20835 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 4.7.2025 passed by a learned Co-ordinate Bench, thus based on parity the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail for the



petitioner.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that son of the informant died in the occurrence and the informant also suffered fire-arm injury, but then the informant on account of treatment was saved. It is further submitted that no doubt allegation of killing the son of the informant is not specific against the petitioner rather the informant alleges that this petitioner along with Sonu and Deepak fired leading to the death of Aaditya. It is next submitted that no doubt Deepak has been granted the privilege of anticipatory bail by a learned Co-ordinate Bench, but then from perusal of the order dated 4.7.2025 in Cr. Misc No. 20835 of 2025, it would manifest that the learned Co-ordinate Bench while granting the privilege of anticipatory bail to Deepak took into consideration the order passed by a learned Co-ordinate Bench in Kiran Devi and this Court in Kanti Kuer and Rita Devi, but then the case of Deepak was different from their cases. It is submitted that no specific allegation against Kiran, Kanti and Rita was alleged of causing fire-arm injury rather in the



FIR, it is alleged that they were watching from a window, but then specific allegation of firing leading to death of Aditya is against the petitioner, Deepak and Sonu.

6. Considering the submission made by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

