

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14998 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-572 Year-2023 Thana- BIDUPUR District- Vaishali

Ram Naresh Ray Son of Ram Hulas Ray Resident of Village- Kutubpur,
Chakmahmad, P.S.- Bidupur, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Mritunjay Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Arun Kumar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Ranjit Kumar Thakur, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

4 25-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Bidupur P.S. Case No. 572 of 2023 instituted for the
offences under Sections 302, 120B of the Indian Penal Code and
Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Accusation against the accused persons is of
commission of murder of the informant's son by hatching
conspiracy.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the
petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case.
Learned counsel further submitted that as per paragraph no. 53
of the case diary, co-accused Prabhat Kumar has specifically



stated that it was the Santosh Kumar who committed the murder of the deceased. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that general and omnibus allegation has been made against the petitioner. No specific overt act is alleged against the petitioner. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP further submitted that as per statement of the Prabhat Kumar made in paragraph no. 53 of the case diary, co-accused Santosh Kumar was already having illicit relationship with the Rupa Kumari before she solemnized marriage with the deceased and the petitioner was well acquainted with the said fact and the co-accused has also threatened the deceased of dire consequences if he solemnizes the marriage with Rupa Kumari. Learned counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State, therefore, jointly prayed that this petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as also the material available in the case diary, in my view, this is not a fit case for anticipatory bail, and hence, I am



not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

8. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the learned court below within a period of six weeks from today and prays for regular bail, the same shall be disposed of on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

