

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64429 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-293 Year-2024 Thana- DIGHA District- Patna

Ravi Kumar@ Ravi Raj son of Loha Singh @ Udit Ray R/o vill- Digha, P.o-
Polsan ,P.s- Digha, Dist-Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Misha Bharti, Adv. Mr. Vishal Vikram Rana, Adv. Mr. Siddhant, Adv. Ms. Ananya Shivani, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :		Ms. Sharda Kumari, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Md. Minatullah, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 17-10-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State along with learned counsel appearing on
behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offence punishable under Sections 307,
120(B), 34 of the Indian Penal Code & Section 27 of the Arms
Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that on 15.05.2024, he was returning home from his
shop at 8.50 P.M. when he was intercepted by seven named
accused persons including the petitioner and the accused started



firing but he managed to escape and thereafter raised alarm when villagers gathered as such the accused fled leaving their auto and motorcycles. It is next alleged that the reason for the occurrence is that on 10.03.2018 his father was killed by Sunny and Nakat (father of Sunny) for not giving extortion and they are in jail and he is a witness in the case, as such an attempt was made on his life.

4. The learned counsel submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that though there is allegation of firing but then the same is not specific nor the informant received any injury. It is next submitted that it does not appear probable that the informant would not have received any firearm injury if so many accused had fired indiscriminately. It is also submitted that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is not a criminal.

5. Learned A.P.P. and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below



within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Digha P.S. Case No.293/2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

7. However, the learned trial court before accepting the bail bonds of the petitioner shall verify his criminal antecedent and in the event if it is found that petitioner has antecedent of even one case, in that event, the present anticipatory bail order shall not be given effect to.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

