

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23443 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-43 Year-2024 Thana- GOPALGANJ TOWN District- Gopalganj

Abhishek Choubey @ Golu Choubey @ Golu @ Abhishek Kumar Chaubey
@ Abhishek Son of Satyendra Choubey @ Satendra Chaubey (Late wrongly
stated in F.I.R.) Resident of Village - Ekderwa (Ekderawan), P.S. - Gopalganj,
District - Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Lokesh Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Vinod Shanker Modi

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 30-04-2025 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 341, 323,
324, 327, 447, 387 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code read with
Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of five cases and the informant alleges
that accused persons including the petitioner came and
demanded extortion of Rs. 10 Lakhs in lieu of allowing him to
construct his boundary wall on 12.01.2024, for which a written
complaint was given to the police, thereafter, on 13.01.2024 the
accused persons again came and Anand assaulted him by butt of
rifle on chest and petitioner threatened that if ransom is not paid,



he would be killed.

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 allegation of demand of ransom is general and omnibus in nature.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that petitioner has antecedent of five cases and from perusal of Para-3 of the anticipatory bail application, it would manifest that petitioner is on bail only in one case, as such, in other four cases he is not on bail and there is a specific allegation against this petitioner that he threatened that in the event if ransom is not paid, the informant would be killed.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

