

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.88816 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-429 Year-2025 Thana- GHOSI District- Jehanabad

Munna Prasad @ Munna Kumar S/O Ram Pravesh Prasad Resident of Village - Pritam Bigha, P.S. - Ghoshi, (Okari), District - Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 89009 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-429 Year-2025 Thana- GHOSI District- Jehanabad

Mallu Yadav @ Ashok Prasad Son of Late Doman Prasad @ Doman Yadav Resident of Village- Pritam Bigha, P.S.- Ghoshi (Okari), District- Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 89046 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-429 Year-2025 Thana- GHOSI District- Jehanabad

Pintu Kumar S/O Bhallu Yadav @ Ashok Prasad @ Mallu Yadav Resident of Village - Pritam Bigha, P.S. - Ghoshi, Okari, District - Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 89169 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-429 Year-2025 Thana- GHOSI District- Jehanabad

Ram Pravesh Prasad Son of Late Doman Yadav Resident of Village - Pritam Bigha, Police Station - Ghoshi (Okari), District - Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus



The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 88816 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shyamal Prakash

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Gauri Shankar Gupta

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 89009 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shyamal Prakash

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nawal Kishore Prasad

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 89046 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shyamal Prakash

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Akshay Lal Pandit

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 89169 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shyamal Prakash

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Akshay Lal Pandit

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA

ORAL ORDER

- 2 15-01-2026 1. Since all these four anticipatory bail applications arise out of Ghoshi (Okari) Police Station Case No. 429 of 2025, with the consent of the parties, all these applications are heard together.
2. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioners and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.
3. These applications, for grant of anticipatory bail, arise out of Ghoshi (Okari) Police Station Case No. 429 of 2025, dated 15.08.2025, disclosing offences punishable under Sections 103(1) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.
4. The prosecution case, as per the First Information Report, is that on 15.08.2025, at about 00:15 hours, co-villager of



the informant, Mita Prasad, came to the house of the informant and told him that his son, Twinkle Kumar, was shot dead near the dalan of Mita Prasad. On this information, all the family members rushed towards the dalan of Mita Prasad and saw that the son of the informant was lying in the lane and blood was oozing out of his head. The informant alleged that two days prior to the occurrence, the petitioners, along with other co-accused persons, had threatened the deceased to kill him, and the deceased had disclosed this fact to his family members.

5. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case due to dispute regarding passage. He further submits that the allegation against the petitioners are general and omnibus in nature and there is no eye-witness to the alleged killing of the son of the informant. He further submits that the deceased had not informed the police about the threaten given by the accused persons.
6. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and submits that the petitioners are named in the First Information Report.



He further submits that just prior to the occurrence, the deceased had been threatened by the accused persons and the deceased had himself disclosed this fact to his family members. He next submits that the offence is serious in nature and the case is still under investigation.

7. Regards being had to the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the seriousness of the offence and the fact that just prior to the occurrence, the deceased was threatened by the accused persons, including the petitioners, I am not inclined to grant the petitioners privilege of anticipatory bail.
8. These applications are, accordingly, dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	✓	T	✓
---	---	---	---

