

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.88801 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-80 Year-2024 Thana- Pura police station District- Gaya

=====

Rahul Kumar @ Rahul Sharma S/O Late Sudhanshu Sharma R/o Vill.- Bhuri,
P.S - Pura, District - Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Tiwary, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Satya Nand Shukla, A.P.P.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

2 16-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Pura
P.S. Case No. 80 of 2024 instituted for the offence under
Sections 121(1), 132, 249 & 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita, 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The prosecution alleges that on 29.11.2024, police
officials raided the houses of co-accused Brishketu Kumar and
Rahul Kumar (Petitioner) to arrest them in connection with
Civil Lines P.S. Case No. 511/2024. During the raid, the
informant was assaulted by Abhishek Kumar, who later fled.
Subsequently, accused Rahul Kumar (Petitioner) fired at the
police and also escaped under the cover of darkness.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the
petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. The
petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence. The



informant is not claiming recovery of any fire arm injury or blank cartridge from the place of occurrence. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that general and omnibus allegation has been made against the petitioner. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has five criminal antecedents.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. There is specific allegation of firing against the petitioner. So far as paragraph no.3 is concerned, the petitioner has five criminal antecedents and he does not deserve privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and also taking into consideration criminal antecedent of the petitioner, in my view, this is not a fit case for anticipatory bail, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

