

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.89389 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-374 Year-2024 Thana- MOTIHARI TOWN District- East
Champaran

=====

Bhola Sahni Son of Dhari Sahni @ Jari Sahni @ Ramdhari Chaudhari @
Ramdhari Sahani Resident of Mohalla- Agrwa ward No. 38, P.S.- Motihari
Town, District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vijay Shankar Shrivastava, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nityanand Tiwary, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 30-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Town P.S. Case No. 374 of 2024, instituted for the offences
under Sections 341, 323, 307, 504, 379 and 506/34 of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that accused persons
named in the F.I.R, including the petitioner, have assaulted the
informant by means of iron rod, lathi, due to which he sustained
injury. It is also alleged that co-accused, namely, vishal Sahni
snatched mobile phone of the informant whereas co-accused,
namely, Sudhir Sahni snatched gold Hanumani from the
informant's neck.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the



petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that general and omnibus allegation has been made against the petitioner. He further submitted that the Doctor found abrasion on forehead of the informant. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that other co-accused has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 23.10.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 76004 of 2024. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has four 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 assault against the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, specific allegation of assault on the head of informant is against 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**.

8. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the learned court below within a period of six weeks from today and



prays for regular bail, the same shall be disposed of on its own
merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

