

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24832 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-4 Year-2024 Thana- HABIBPUR District- Bhagalpur

Md. Soni @ Md. Imran Ansari S/o Md. Ekram Ansari R/o Mohalla -
Gulabigagh Lane, Sukhrullachak, P.s. - Mojahidpur, Distt. - Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Amrendra Kumar Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shailendra Kumar

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

3 11-07-2024 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well
as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is seeking regular bail in connection
with Habibbpur P.S. Case No. 04 of 2024 for the offences
punishable under Section 387, 307, 34, 120(B) of the Indian
Penal Code and Section 27 Arms Act.

3. As per allegation, the informant and his friend Md.
Rinku were contractors and they were engaged in construction
work. The three named accused persons, including the petitioner
had demanded ransom and due to non-fulfillment of the same,
the petitioner had threatened Md. Rinku of dire consequences
and started obstructing the work of housing construction. On
05.01.2024, co-accused Md. Firdaus had come to the house of
the informant and demanded Rs. 10 lacs ransom and also



threatened to kill him if his demand is not fulfilled. On the day of occurrence, at about 09:30 AM, when the informant was going with one Md. Ajju, three miscreants came by motorcycle and they fired at the informant. The informant saw the petitioner carrying pistol.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He has further submitted that when the informant was proceeding at the time of occurrence, Md. Ajju was also walking with the informant. The statement of Md. Ajju has been recorded in paragraph no. 6 of the case diary, from perusal of which, it appears that he failed to identify the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that prior to the occurrence, this petitioner had demanded ransom from the informant, and also threatened to kill him had his demand remained unfulfilled. He has further submitted that the allegation is corroborated by the medical evidence as fire arm injury was found on the person of the informant. He has also submitted that in paragraph no. 11 of the case diary, the statement of Md. Rinku has been recorded. **He has also submitted that the petitioner has a criminal antecedent and**



three cases are pending against him.

6. Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances and also the fact that the statement of the informant and witnesses have corroborated by the medical evidence, I do not think it to be a fit case for bail, which is hereby rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Nirmal/-

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

