

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.87116 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-128 Year-2025 Thana- SURYAPURA District- Rohtas

Kewal Raj Mehta @ Micky Raj Mehta, S/o Late Bakey Bihari Singh, R/o Village - Nonahar, P.S - Suryapura, District – Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Ms. Usha Kumari 1, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Upendra Kumar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Sudhanshu Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 01-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The present petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner, apprehending his arrest, in connection with Suryapura P.S. Case No.128 of 2025, dated-24.04.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 333, 303(2), 308(2), 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023.

3. As per allegation, the Petitioner along with other co-accused came to the house of the Informant and without any reason, they started abusing the Informant and when the Informant came out of his house, he was assaulted indiscriminately by the Petitioner and thereafter, he assaulted



the Informant even by knife taking out from his pocket, causing grievous injury to the Informant. As per further allegation, the Petitioner entered the house of the Informant with *dabang* villagers and assaulted the family members of the informant, throwing the household items and utensils. Even air firing was done by the Petitioner and he went away abusing the Informant and taking away some gold ornaments. Thereafter, the Informant was taken to local primary health center. It is further stated in the FIR that this occurrence had taken place on account of the fact that the Petitioner is husband of local *Mukhiya* and he was doing financial irregularity in the work of construction of local *nala* and hence, the Informant had given complaint against this act of the Petitioner. Thereafter, the Petitioner was putting pressure upon the Informant to take back the complaint against him, and when he did not oblige him, he was assaulted by the Petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that as per the injury report, the alleged injury caused by the Petitioner is simple in nature and this case is politically motivated because the Petitioner happens to be the husband of local *mukhiya*. He also submits that this case has



been filed by the Informant as a counterblast to the criminal case filed by the colleague of the Petitioner.

5. It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the bail petition that the petitioner has not moved this Court earlier either for anticipatory bail or regular one in the instant case.

6. It has further been stated in paragraph no.3 of the petition that the petitioner has been made accused in ten other case.

7. However, learned counsel for the Informant and learned APP for the State vehemently oppose the prayer of the Petitioner for bail submitting that it is classic case of local *dabangai* and misuse of political and muscle power by the Petitioner against the common people of the village, who were opposing the corruption in construction of local *nala*. They also submit that the Petitioner is influencing the investigation of the case because he is politically dominant and the local *thana* is under his influence and if he is enlarged on anticipatory bail, it will not only discourage the honest citizen of the village to take step against corruption being done in development work in the village but even it will encourage *dabangai* of the Petitioner.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not persuaded to enlarge the Petitioner on bail.



9. The present petition is rejected, Accordingly.

(Jitendra Kumar, J.)

Chandan/-

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

