

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25674 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-409 Year-2024 Thana- KUCHAIKOTE District- Gopalganj

=====

Ankit Kumar @ Ankit Sah S/o- Sunil Sah R/o- Bathna Nechwajalpur, PS-
Kuchaikote, District- Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Indrajeet Bhushan, Advocate

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

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 24-04-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Kuchaikote P.S. Case No. 409 of 2024 instituted for the offences under Sections 318(4), 316(2), 317(5), 338, 336(3), 341(1) of BNS and 25(1-b)a, 26, 35 of the Arms Act.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that, upon receiving secret information, the police conducted a raid at the house of co-accused Arvind Prasad where cyber criminals were living and were involved in cheating the innocent people. The police apprehended the accused persons and, on search, two motorcycles along with mobile phones, tablet, and other articles were recovered from the possession of the accused persons. It is



further alleged that one country-made pistol has also been recovered from the room.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. The name of the petitioner is being dragged in this case on the basis of disclosure made by the accused persons who were apprehended on the spot. 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. Learned counsel further submitted that it has been alleged by the apprehended co-accused person that this petitioner had arranged for the room in which the co-accused persons were residing but no independent witness has supported this fact. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP further submitted that this petitioner is the main accused who has arranged the room for the other co-accused persons to commit the crime and therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances



of the case, in my view, this is not a fit case for anticipatory bail,
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 considered and disposed
of on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

