

IN THE COURT OF SRI DEEPAK KUMAR-I, ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE- II, BHAGALPUR

Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 568/2026

(Arising out of **Madhusudanpur P.S. Case No. 32/2026**)

U/s 111 BNS and 25 (1-A), 25 (1-AA), 25 (1) (a), 25 (7) (i), 26 (2)/35 Arms Act

Md. Faisal Ansari @ Faisal, age 50 years, S/o Md. Samim @ Md. Samiullah, R/o Hakim Shah Lane, Champanagar, P.S. Nathnagar, District Bhagalpur**Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Bihar**Opp. Party**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. S.M. Haidar Imam, Ld. Advocate.

For the State : Mr. Kashi Nath Mishra, Ld. A.P.P.

Date of order	Order with signature of the court
1	2
11-05-2026	This is a petition filed on behalf of the above named accused-petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail who apprehension his arrest in connection with Madhusudanpur P.S. Case No. 32/2026 for offences punishable U/s 111 BNS and 25 (1-A), 25 (1-AA), 25 (1) (a), 25 (7) (i), 26 (2)/35 Arms Act. On behalf of the petitioner a certificate has been given in bail petition that earlier no anticipatory or regular bail petition has been filed on his behalf either before the Court of the Ld. Principal Sessions Judge, Bhagalpur or before the Hon'ble High Court, Patna. In para-3 of bail petition, accused-petitioner has given certificate that he has one criminal antecedent bearing Nathnagar P.S. Case No. 1000/22 U/s 25 (1-b)a, 25 (1-AA), 25 (1-A), 26 (i) (ii) 35 Arms Act. Prosecution case, as per the self-statement of S.I. Md. Safdar Ali, SHO Madhusudanpur P.S., in brief, is that on 17.02.2026 at about 11:30 hours was working of Sirista, in the meanwhile, he got information from Bhagalpur STF and Bengal police that the work of an illegal weapons were going in the house of Md. Nasir Ansari at village Rahmat Bagh (Kabirpur). On information, he alongwith other police personnel reached at the house of Md. Nasir and surrounded his house and saw that some persons were trying to flee away after seeing the police party but anyhow five miscreants were caught by the police and one person succeeded in fleeing away. On inquiry, caught persons told their names as Md. Aslam, Md. Shahanabaz, Md. Shamsher Alam, Md. Sadab Ali, Md. Monazir Ansari and disclosed the name of escaped person as Md. Faisal Ansari by the Md. Monazir. On search, semi-made pistol 20 pieces, semi-made bairal 8 pieces and huge quantity of machinery which are used in making the illegal weapons were recovered from the room and one motorcycle bearing BR 10 AT 6598 was also recovered from the place of occurrence. It is further alleged that Md. Faisal has given this house to Md. Nasir on rent of Rs. 2000/- per day and caught persons were working of making of illegal weapons in the house of Md. Faisal and Md. Faisal delivered the illegal weapons outside and recovered motorcycle bearing BR 10 AT 6598 is the in the name of Md. Faisal. Md. Faisal has already gone jail in Arms Act. On demand no any valid paper has been produced by the caught persons. Thereafter, seizure list was prepared. Hence, this FIR is lodged. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence and has falsely been implicated in this case. It has further been submitted that the name of the petitioner has come in this case on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused Md. Monazir and nothing any incriminating material has been recovered from the possession of this accused-petitioner and

IN THE COURT OF SRI DEEPAK KUMAR-I, ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE- II, BHAGALPUR

Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 568/2026

(Arising out of **Madhusudanpur P.S. Case No. 32/2026**)

U/s 111 BNS and 25 (1-A), 25 (1-AA), 25 (1) (a), 25 (7) (i), 26 (2)/35 Arms Act

Contd...P/2
11-05-2026

petitioner is not a tenant or owner of the alleged house and so far motorcycle bearing No. BR 10AT 6598 is concern petitioner is owner of the alleged motorcycle but on the same day co-accused Md. Monazir used the said motorcycle who is in relation of the petitioner and so far section 111 of BNS is concern which is not attract against this accused-petitioner and similarly sections of Arms Act not attract and petitioner is not claiming any seized materials save and except motorcycle. On such basis, it has been prayed that petitioner be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

Heard both the parties.

Heard both sides and perused the record as well as case diary and on perusal the same it transpires that there is allegation against this accused-petitioner that he alongwith other co-accused persons have running a work of making illegal weapons in a room which was taken on rent of Rs. 2000/- per day by this accused-petitioner and he succeeded in fleeing away from the place of occurrence when police was raid. The caught persons have taken the name of this accused-petitioner who stated that this accused-petitioner is main accused he delivered the illegal weapons outside and one motorcycle bearing Reg. No. BR 10AT 6598 was also recovered from the place of occurrence which relates to this accused-petitioner. Para-2 of the case diary is the seizure list which reveals that semi-made pistol 20 pieces, semi-made Bairal 8 pieces and huge quantity of machinery which were used in making the illegal weapons have been recovered from the place of occurrence. Para-2 of the case diary is the restatement of informant who reiterated the prosecution case. Para- 4 and 5 of the case diary are the statements of witnesses have also supported the prosecution case. Para- 47 of the case diary is the supervision note which reveals that police has found the case true against this accused-petitioners and others in committing the making of illegal weapons. Para-75 of the case diary reveals that accused-petitioner has one criminal antecedent bearing Nathnagar P.S. Case No. 1000/22 U/s 25 (1-b)a, 25 (1-AA), 25 (1-A), 26 (i) (ii) 35 Arms Act. Para-79 of the case diary reveals that the recovered motorcycle bearing Reg. No. BR 10AT 6598 from the place of occurrence is in the name of Md. Faisal Ansari. Further, such type of activities defines and penalizes organised crime. Further, investigation against this accused-petitioner is still pending.

Keeping in view the nature of the offence, complicity & conduct of the accused petitioner, severity of punishment and submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, the allegation against the petitioner is serious in nature. So, I am of the view that applicant/petitioner does not deserve for anticipatory bail. Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby **Rejected**.

Sd/-

Additional Sessions Judge-II
Bhagalpur