

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18865 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-321 Year-2024 Thana- MURLIGANJ District- Madhepura

Ravindra Yadav @ Ravindra Kumar S/O Late Mahendra Yadav R/O Vill.-
Gangapur, Ward no. 7, P.S.- Murliganj, Dist.- Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dinesh Prasad Verma, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Abhay Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 23-07-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 118(1), 109,
61(2) and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges that
his brother Ankesh Kumar runs a shop of construction material.
Further, petitioner took some construction materials from the shop
of the brother of the informant for an amount of Rs.10 lakhs on
credit. It is next alleged that whenever informant's brother
demanded the amount, the petitioner refused to pay and threatened
to kill, in the meantime, petitioner was arrested in connection with
Kumarkhand P.S. Case No. 123 of 2024. It is next alleged that on



01.07.2024, at about 09:30 a.m., the brother of the informant was sitting in his shop when on a white colour motorcycle three persons came and started asking the rate of construction material, in the meantime, two of the accused fired causing injury on head and chest of Ankesh Kumar and he fell down and thereafter the miscreants fled away disclosing that the contract for killing was given by the petitioner. Thereafter people gathered and the brother of the informant was taken to the Primary Health Centre, Murliganj for treatment from where he was referred to Madhepura where the statement of the brother of the informant was recorded in a pen drive.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that when the occurrence took place at that time the petitioner was in custody. It is next submitted that it absolutely does not stand to reason that had the petitioner given contract to the killers for killing the brother of the informant in that event the contract killers after committing the occurrence would have disclosed the name of the petitioner that at his behest the killing was done. It is also submitted that this amply demonstrates that the informant with a view to implicate the petitioner in the instant case falsely alleged that the name of the petitioner was disclosed by the contract killers who after



committing the occurrence fled away. It is submitted that cousin sister of the informant was married to the petitioner and on account of matrimonial dispute they separated, as such, the relationship in between the family of the petitioner and the informant was strained, hence, he came to be implicated in the instant case.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner but then are not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that it does not appear probable that the accused who killed the brother of the informant while fleeing would have disclosed the name of the petitioner that it was at his behest that the occurrence was committed.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant at this stage submits that investigation in the case is continuing and if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond on which learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove his innocence.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, let 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 Murliganj P.S. Case No. 321 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

8. One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his nephew, namely, Amresh Kumar.

9. However, 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, the learned trial court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

