

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MUNGER
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION No.- 466/2026

Shubham Singh Vs. The State of Bihar
Dharhara P.S. Case No. 173/2025

24.04.2026

1. The present anticipatory bail application has been preferred by petitioner **Shubham Singh**, s/o- Munna Singh, who is apprehending arrest in connection with Dharhara P.S. Case No. 173/2025 u/ss 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 109, 329(3), 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of B.N.S., pending in the Court of Ld. A.C.J.M. III, Munger.

2. The informant has alleged that all the accused persons including the petitioner armed with lathi-danda entered his house and started abusing. On objection all the accused persons with an intention to kill assaulted his father over a previous dispute as a result of which he suffered injuries. He further alleged that when he along with his sister tried to save his father they also assaulted them. Hence the information, based on which the above stated P.S. case was registered.

3. At the outset the Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has certified that previously no anticipatory or regular bail has been filed on behalf of the petitioner before this Court or before any other Court including the Hon'ble High Court. He also certified that **the petitioner has no criminal cases pending against him**. The Ld. Counsel submits that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence and further that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. That dispute arose due to previous dispute. Therefore the Ld Counsel pleads that the petitioner be granted the privilege of pre-arrest bail.

4. The Ld. P.P. has opposed the prayer of anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is a named accused of the F.I.R. and the investigation in the case is continuing. From the respective injury reports,

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MUNGER
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION No.- 466/2026

Shubham Singh Vs. The State of Bihar
Dharhara P.S. Case No. 173/2025

it is apparent that the victims have suffered injuries on the vital parts of body which have been opined to be grievous in nature.

5. Heard the submissions of respective Id. Counsels and perused the record of the case.

6. From perusal of the case record, it appears that the petitioner is a named accused of the F.I.R. and the investigation in the case is continuing. From the respective injury reports, it is apparent that the victims have suffered injuries on the vital parts of body which have been opined to be grievous in nature. That the witnesses as well as independent witnesses in their respective statements on paras 51, 113 and 114 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case. The petitioner has two criminal cases pending against him as per para 18 of the case dairy however the Id. Counsel in the present anticipatory bail application has certified that he has no criminal cases pending against him.

7. Therefore, considering the seriousness and gravity of the offence, wrong certification with regard to criminal antecedent, the nature of allegations and in the totality of the facts and the circumstances of the case in my view no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out. Hence, the present petition is hereby **Rejected**.

Dictated

(ALOK GUPTA)
Sessions Judge, Munger
Dated:- 24.04.2026