

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15460 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-27 Year-2023 Thana- KARPI District- Jehanabad

Dharmendra Kumar S/O Late Khargu Singh R/O Vill.- Shiv Nagar, P.S.-
Karpi, Dist.- Arwal

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Mukesh Kumar S/O Upendra Sharma R/O Vill.- Shiv Nagar, P.S.- Karpi,
Dist.- Arwal
3. Shivam Kumar S/O Ram Sidh Sharma R/O Vill.- Shiv Nagar, P.S.- Karpi,
Dist.- Arwal

... .. Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Ms. Gulnar Begum, APP
For the Opp. Party Nos.2 and 3	:	Ms. Shyamli Kumari, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 29-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State

2. This application has been filed for
cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the opposite party
nos.2 and 3 by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court *vide* order
dated 20.12.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No.72871 of 2024 in
connection with Karpi P.S Case No.27 of 2023 registered for the
offence under Sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 323 and 308 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. I have considered the submissions made on
behalf of the parties and perused the impugned order granting
anticipatory bail to the opposite party nos.2 and 3. I have also
perused the F.I.R. It appears that the petitioner, who is the
informant of the case, had appeared before the Co-ordinate



Bench of this Court and opposed the prayer of the opposite party nos.2 and 3 for grant of bail and after considering the submissions of the parties, the Co-ordinate Bench had granted anticipatory bail to the opposite party nos.2 and 3. If the petitioner was/is aggrieved by the order of the Co-ordinate Bench, he could have moved before the Hon'ble Supreme Court against the order of the Co-ordinate Bench. This Court cannot sit in appeal over the exercise of discretion granting anticipatory bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court. Therefore, I do not find any error in the impugned order.

4. In view of the above, this Court finds no sufficient ground to interfere with the impugned order. Accordingly, this application is rejected.

5. With regard to the submission of the petitioner that the accused persons are threatening him, he is given liberty to approach the Superintendent of Police, Jehanabad for redressal of his grievances.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Shalini/ Pawan

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

