

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT & ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-III, KATIHAR
ANTICIPATORY BAIL PETITION NO. 663/2026
(Arising out of Muffassil P.S. Case No. 230/2024)

Kaila Parihar @ Kailash Parihar ... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar ... Opposite Party

Ld. Counsel for the petitioner:- Sri Md. Aftab Alam, Advocate
Ld. Counsel for the State :- Sri Akhilesh Singh, APP

Date of hearing/Disposal: 01.06.2026

ORDER

An anticipatory bail petition has been filed on behalf of the accused petitioner namely (1) Kaila Parihar @ Kailash Parihar, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Muffassil P.S. Case No. 230/2024 for the offence registered U/S 115(2), 126(2), 118(1), 109, 351(2), 352, 3(5) of the B.N.S. The copy of the same has already been duly served to the Ld. Addl. P.P. for the State.

Heard the Ld. counsel for the petitioner and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

The Ld. counsel of the petitioner has submitted that no B.P. or A.B.P. on behalf of the accused petitioner have been filed or moved earlier before this court or before the Hon'ble High Court, Patna. The petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence and he has been falsely implicated in this case. That the petitioner has no any criminal history. That both parties are co-neighbours. That there is no allegation of theft. That there is no specific allegation against the petitioner. The petitioner is local man and no chance of their absconding. The petitioner is ready to furnish local and solvent bailors to the satisfaction of the court. Accordingly, prayed to grant bail.

On the other hand, the Ld. Addl. P.P. vehemently opposed the prayer of A.B.P. filed on behalf of the above named accused petitioner and submitted that the petitioner have committed the alleged offence under well planned manner. Hence, it is requested to reject the petition of the above named accused petitioner.

The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 29.09.2024 at about 08:00 PM entered the house of the informant and started abusing filthy language. They were armed with rod, stick and other weapons. The accused persons dragged them and attacked them with fists and blows. They also threatened them with dire consequences and warned that they would kill them if they reported the matter. Hence, the present case.

Heard rival submission of the Ld. counsel on behalf of the accused petitioner and the Ld. Addl.P.P. for the State and perused the C.D. From perusal of the same, it transpires that the case has been registered for the offence punishable U/S 126(2),

115(2), 118(1), 109, 352, 351(2), 303(2), 3(5) of BNS against the accused person. Petitioner is named accused in the F.I.R. and there is no specific allegation against the petitioner to assault the victim at his head with sharp cut weapon. In medical examination, incised wound would have been found in right frontal region which is grievous in nature. It is evident that injury has been found at the vital part of the body. The role attributed to the petitioner is distinct and serious in nature.

Hence, considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and discussions made hereinabove and keeping in mind the seriousness of accusation and gravity of offences, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail at this stage. Accordingly, prayer for anticipatory bail of the above named accused petitioners stand **rejected**.

(Sd/-)

(Sunil Kumar Singh-III)
D.A.S.J.- III, Katihar
01.06.2026