

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12879 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-999 Year-2024 Thana- GAYA MUFASIL District- Gaya

Sumant Singh @ Sumant Kumar Singh Son of Late Sanjay Singh village-
Gore, Ps- Gaya Muffasil, Dist- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Aryan Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Veena Kumari Jaiswal

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-04-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 308(2),
308(3), 126(2), 115(2), 351 and 352 of the Bhartiya Nyaya
Sanhita, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the informant alleges
that the petitioner along with unknown accused was persistently
demanding extortion of Rs. 5,000/- per day from the staff of the
informant and on 15-11-2024, the petitioner along with the
unknown accused came and threatened the staff that if extortion
is not paid, they will be killed and also threatened to stop the
mining work.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner next submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case. It is further submitted that the petitioner's plot is by the side of the plot of the informant on which he is doing mining. It is also submitted that on account of dispute regarding purchase of stone chips, the present false case came to be instituted. It is next submitted that the informant is a resident of Uttar Pradesh, as such, it does not appear probable that the informant would have known that how many criminal antecedents the petitioner carries. It is further submitted that since their business is side by side, as such, in good times, the petitioner had disclosed to the informant that he has been implicated falsely in two cases, as such, when the dispute arose, the present false case came to be instituted.

5. The learned APP opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that there is allegation against this petitioner of seeking extortion, and the submission made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is not clearly pleaded in the anticipatory bail application. It is also submitted that in the event if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner



submits that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove his innocence.

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 trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-five 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 Gaya Muffasil P.S. Case No. 999 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

7. However, it is made clear that in the event, if the Investigating Officer of the case files an application before the learned trial court bringing to its notice that the petitioner, despite giving assurance to this Court, is not cooperating in the investigation or is not presenting himself as and when required, the learned trial court shall be at liberty to forthwith cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner after recording reasons.

8. It is further made clear that if charge sheet is submitted connecting the petitioner with the offence, in that event, the present anticipatory bail order shall lose its effect.



9. Let a copy of this order be sent to the concerned police station through the learned Trial Court.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

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

