

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32861 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-947 Year-2024 Thana- GAYA MUFASIL District- Gaya

=====

Ravi Kumar son of Krishndeo Prasad Vill - Bhadeji, P.S - Muffasil, Dist -
Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Birendra Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Akshay Lal Pandit, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 15-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 947 of 2024 instituted for the offences under Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3), 109, 303(2), 317(2), 317(4), 315(5), 111, 125, 132, 121(1), 121(2) of the BNS and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that, police, on the basis of information that some accused persons were extracting sand illegally from the Falgu river, raided the place. Seeing the police the accused persons tried to flee away but six of them were apprehended by the police and 21 tractors loaded with sand were seized. It is further alleged that some miscreant also



made indiscriminate firing upon the police party.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. 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 the allegation of firing is not attributed to the petitioner and no one got injured in the said incident. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has three criminal antecedents.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submitted that petitioner is habitual offender of similar nature of cases as per paragraph no. 3 of the bail application. Learned APP further submitted that the tractor registered in the name of the petitioner, partially loaded with illegal sand was also seized from the place of occurrence and, therefore, his complicity in the alleged offence cannot be denied and the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case as also the three criminal antecedent of the petitioner of similar nature, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the



petitioner.

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

8. Petitioner is directed to surrender before the learned court below within a period of six weeks and seek regular bail. If any such application is filed before the learned court below, the court concerned shall consider the same on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

