

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.835 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-110 Year-2025 Thana- BHADAUR District- Patna

=====

Anant Singh @ Anant Kumar Singh S/o Late Chandradeep @ Late Chandradip Prasad @ Late Chandradip Singh, Resident of Village- Nadwan, P.S.- Barh, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Naresh Dikshit, Advocate
Ms. Shruti Singh, Advocate
Mr. Utkarsh Pathak, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh, APP

For the Informant : Mr. Shivnandan Bharti, Advocate
Ms. Neha Kumari Singh, Advocate
Ms. Shipra Chandra, Advocate
Ms. Priya Rani, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

5 19-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant. Perused

the case diary.

2. In view of the minutes of Hon'ble the Chief Justice,

the matter has been listed before this Court.

3. The petitioner seeks bail in Bhadaur P.S. case No.

110 of 2025 instituted for the offences under Sections 103(1),

3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 27 of the

Arms Act.

4. The prosecution case, in short, is that while the



informant and his grandfather were moving on the vehicle in the rally of a political party, in the meantime, on the way, the petitioner and his associates arrived and started abusing his grandfather. When his grandfather opposed, co-accused Rajveer Singh and Karamveer Singh took him out from his vehicle and thereafter the petitioner fired upon him which hit on the heel of the left leg due to which he fell down. Thereafter, co-accused Chotan Singh and Kanjay Singh, having iron rod in their hands, assaulted on his stomach, back and head and thereafter crushed him with Thar vehicle and thereafter fled away. The deceased died on the way to the hospital.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the FIR, allegation has been made that the petitioner fired on the heel of the left leg of the deceased and there is no any repetition, as such, there was no intention of the petitioner to kill the deceased and also there was no intervening circumstances as such. The injury sustained by the deceased is also on the non-vital part of the body. In the post-mortem report,



the cause of death has not shown to be one which has been caused by the firearm rather cause of death is by hard and blunt substance due to hypovolemic shock caused by crushed injury of lungs and heart which is alleged to have been committed by the co-accused and not on the petitioner. Thus, the post-mortem report does not corroborate the allegation made in the F.I.R. Learned counsel, referring to paragraph No. 212 of the case diary, states that the father of the informant has stated that while he was in office, his son has informed him on mobile that his father has died and has not mentioned the name of the petitioner or anyone else. Further, the supervisory authority has given specific instruction to take the statements and videography of the persons who were deputed there. Their statements had been recorded in paragraph Nos. 81 to 191 of the case diary and they have stated that no one has seen the petitioner firing on the deceased and further that no one was carrying any arms. No independent witness has stated anything about firing made by this petitioner. It is further submitted that no cartridges/empty cartridges were recovered from the place of occurrence. Learned counsel further submits that the deceased was a hard-core criminal. It is further submitted that another FIR has been lodged for the same occurrence gives a different story. The



petitioner is in custody since 02.11.2025 and has got sixteen criminal antecedents in which he is on bail in all cases as stated in paragraph 3 of the application. Further, in paragraph 3A of the application, it is stated that the petitioner has been made accused in fifty-one cases in which he is either acquitted or final form has been submitted against him, although, in the case diary, it has been shown that the petitioner has twenty-seven criminal antecedents. Learned counsel submits that because of the political rivalry, a number of cases were filed against the petitioner for ulterior motive.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned counsel for the informant submits that specific allegation of firing on the heel of the left leg of the deceased has been attributed to the petitioner. Learned counsel for the informant further submits paragraph 174 of the case diary reveals that the petitioner has altogether twenty-seven criminal antecedents and, as such, he does not deserve the privilege of bail. The post-mortem report specifically states that cause of death is cardiorespiratory failure on account of hypovolemic shock caused by crushed injury of lungs and heart by hard and blunt substance. Police has submitted charge-sheet



against the petitioner under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 351(2), 109, 103(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act while investigation is pending with regard to other co-accused.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, submissions made on behalf of both the parties, allegation made in the F.I.R, charge-sheet being submitted, cause of death on account of cardiorespiratory failure due to shock caused by crushed injury of lungs and heart by hard and blunt substance and not of firearm, several criminal antecedents against the petitioner on account of his political rivalry and the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Let the petitioner be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.15,000/- (Fifteen thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Court below/concerned Court in connection with Bhadaur P.S. case No. 110 of 2025, subject to the following conditions:

(I) One of the bailors shall be own/close member of the family of the petitioner.

(II) The petitioner shall appear on each and every date fixed at the trial and shall not remain absent on two consecutive



dates without sufficient cause.

(III) The petitioner will not tamper with the prosecution evidence or influence/intimidate any witness during the course of the trial.

If any of the above conditions are violated, the Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Pankaj/-
Rajorshi/-

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

