

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7825 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-734 Year-2023 Thana- LAHERIMUHALLA District- Nalanda

Md. Irshad Ali @ Irshad @ Chawanni S/o- Md. Afsar Ali Village- Khasganj
PS-Sohsarai District- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Diwakar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 23-07-2025 Heard Mr. Diwakar, learned counsel for the
petitioner and Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey, learned APP.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Laheri P.S. Case No. 734 of 2023 dated 06.12.2023 registered under Sections 364(A)/34 of the IPC.

3. As per the First Information Report on 05.12.2023, the informant has alleged that while he was moving along with his friends, four accused persons arrived on two motorcycles and picked him up forcibly and was taken to several places. Thereafter, the informant was forced to unlock his mobile phone to pay Rs. 89000/- through pay phone. It has further been alleged that the brother of the informant was also pressurized to pay Rs. 8,00,000/- in lieu of his release as ransom amount. The said amount of Rs. 8,00,000/- was transferred to different



accounts of the accused persons.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is not named in the FIR and he has falsely been made accused on the basis of confessional statement of a co-accused, namely, Md. Saheb. Not even a single penny has been transferred to the bank account of the petitioner and except confessional statement of co-accused, there is no material against the petitioner to connect him with the present offence. Lastly, it has been submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case due to previous enmity. He denied that he was present on the place of occurrence.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits referring to the different paragraphs of the case diary that the informant was kidnapped, ransom amount was paid in the bank account of several accused persons. The name of the petitioner has come on the basis of confessional statement of the co-accused, Md. Saheb and the petitioner has been identified in the CCTV footage along with other co-accused person and this fact is mentioned in paragraph-24 of the case diary.

6. Regard being had to the submissions made by the parties, taking into consideration the gravity of offence and the



fact that co-accused person has disclosed the name of petitioner as one of the accomplices which may be the basis of further investigation against the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The same is, hereby, rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

perwez

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

