

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.85830 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-25 Year-2025 Thana- Bhelahi District- East Champaran

=====

Dharmveer Chaurasia Son of Late Bhola Chaurasia @ Late Bhola Raut  
Resident of village- Bhelahi (Bhalahi), P.S.- Bhelahi, District -East  
Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ajay Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ajay Kumar Jha

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      18-02-2026                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and  
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his  
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under  
Sections 317(2), 317(4), 317(5), 3(5) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that  
the petitioner has antecedent of five cases and is on bail in all  
the five cases and the informant alleges that an information was  
received that unknown accused are indulging in trade of bones,  
the informant along with the force reached the place of  
occurrence and apprehended seven accused persons along with  
150 sacks filled with animal bones loaded on a tractor, thus  
alleges that apprehended accused were involved in illegal trade



of animal bones.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is not named in the FIR and from perusal of the FIR, it would manifest that seven persons were apprehended, but then, the apprehended accused did not disclose the name of the petitioner, but subsequently the name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of apprehended accused. It is further submitted that the apprehended accused initially had disclosed that they were not aware of the name of the persons who were involved in the trade, but had only stated that apart from them, 8-10 unknown accused are also involved in the occurrence. It is thus submitted that when the apprehended accused initially did not disclose the name of the petitioner that amply demonstrates that subsequently the police got the petitioner implicated because of his antecedents. It is further submitted that Javed Miyan had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.75570 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 20.11.2025.

5. Learned A.P.P. vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that case of the petitioner is not akin to the case of Javed Miyan as Javed Miyan had antecedent of one case whereas petitioner has antecedent of five cases. It is



also submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence. It is next submitted that initially apprehended accused did not disclose the name of the petitioner, but subsequently when they were arrested, the name of the petitioner was disclosed during the time of interrogation. It is further submitted that even investigation of the case is continuing and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence..

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 |  |
|---|--|---|--|

