

Present: Jyoti Kumar Kashyap, DASJ-XI, Bhagalpur

BP No. 286/2026

Industrial P.S. Case No. 43/2026

State Vs. Arbind Tanti

Dated:-15-04-2026

In the Court of District & Additional Sessions Judge-XI, Bhagalpur

(Bail Petition No.- 286/2026)

(In connection with Industrial P.S. Case No. 43/2026)

=====
In the matter of :

Arbind Tanti, aged about 54 years, S/o Late Naresh Tanti, Resident of village-
Meerachak, P.S.- Industrial, District- Bhagalpur ---- Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Bihar ---- Respondent.

=====
Crl. Antecedent : 01 (as per case diary).
=====

Appearance:-

Counsel for the Petitioner :- Mr. Narayan Pathak, Ld. Advocate.

Counsel for the Respondent :- Mr. Rajendra Choudhary, Ld. A. P. P.
=====

15-04-2026

1. This is an application for grant of regular bail U/S 483 BNSS 2023 (corresponding to section 439 Cr.P.C), filed on behalf of above-named accused-petitioner, who is in custody since 02-03-2026, in connection with Industrial P.S. Case No. 43/2026, punishable for the offences U/s 25(1-B)(a), 26 of Arms Act.

2. Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and learned Addl. P.P for the State.

3. Learned counsel for the accused-petitioner has filed necessary certificate in para-02 of the bail petition stating therein that earlier petitioner has not filed any bail petition either before the learned Court of Sessions or before the Hon'ble High Court, Patna. Petitioner has got no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-03 of bail petition.

4. Ld. counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence. He has falsely been implicated in this case. Entire allegation against the petitioner is false and concocted. The alleged sections are not at all applicable against the petitioner. In fact, nothing incriminating has been recovered from the conscious possession of petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 02-03-2026. On such grounds, petitioner may be enlarged on bail.

5. On the other hand, the Ld. A.P.P vehemently opposes the contention of the petitioner and submitted that the alleged sections are made out against the petitioner, hence, he does not deserve the privilege of bail and his prayer for bail may be refused.

6. The prosecution case as stated in the First Information Report is that on 01-03-2026 at about 08:10 hours, the informant S.I. Dashrath Ojha of Industrial P.S. along with other police personnel were proceeded for day patrolling duty. During patrolling, at 15:10 hours he received information that fight is going on at village Mirachak across river Ganga.

Present: Jyoti Kumar Kashyap, DASJ-XI, Bhagalpur

BP No. 286/2026

Industrial P.S. Case No. 43/2026

State Vs. Arbind Tanti

Dated:-15-04-2026

Thereafter, for verification and necessary action, at 15:35 hours, he reached at the place and saw that Kamleshwari Mandal, Kishore Kumar & people caught one person and a country made pistol was visible in the right pocket of his jeans. On query, the said apprehended person disclosed his name as Arvind Tanti and on search being made a country made pistol and a cartridge were recovered. On opening of barrel, a cartridge was recovered which was loaded in country made pistol. Accordingly, the recovered articles was seized as per seizure-list. The apprehended person was formally being arrested and he was remanded to judicial custody and on the basis of typed application of informant the present case has been instituted.

7. Having heard both the parties and perused the case record, which transpires that FIR has been registered U/s 25(1-B)(a), 26 of Arms Act against the petitioner. As per FIR & seizure-list it transpires that arms & ammunitions were recovered and seized in this case. The allegation has been corroborated and fully supported by the informant in his restatement at para 8 of the case diary and other witnesses at para- 11 and 12 of the case diary respectively. The petitioner has not mentioned the criminal history and stated that he has clean antecedent whereas the petitioner bears criminal history as one criminal case i.e. Industrial Area P.S. Case No. 40/2026 is pending against him. Moreover, the investigation of the case is still under progress and release of the petitioner at this stage may adversely affect the fair investigation.

8. Having considered the aforesaid facts and circumstances, nature & gravity of the offence, specific allegation against the petitioner, non-disclosure of criminal antecedent and the role played by the petitioner, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage. Accordingly, his prayer for bail stands rejected for the present and the bail petition is disposed of. However, the petitioner is given liberty that he may renew his prayer for bail after submission of charge-sheet.

(Dictated and corrected by me)

Sd/-

District & Additional Sessions Judge-XI

Bhagalpur.

Dated 15-04-2026