

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39721 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-319 Year-2024 Thana- PHULWARISHARIF District- Patna

Ravi Gope @ Brinda Rai @ Birendra Rai, S/o- Chand Dev Rai, R/o Mohalla-
Manjhauri, P.S.- Phulwarisharif, Dist- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Akshay Tripathi, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mukesh Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 03-09-2025 Heard Mr. Akshay Tripathi, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Mukesh Kumar Singh, learned APP for the

State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Phulwarisharif P.S. Case No. 319 of 2024 dated 29.02.2024 registered for the offences punishable under sections 341, 323, 354, 387, 307, 436, 504 and 506 read with section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant alleged that the petitioner, along with co-accused Chandan Rai, used to demand extortion money of Rs. 5,000/- per month and on account of non-fulfillment of the said demand, on 17.02.2024 at around 16:30 hours, when the informant was returning with his daughter, aged 6 months, the petitioner and co-accused



Chandan Rai assaulted him and his daughter and threw them into the canal, due to which he became unconscious. The informant further alleged that later, the petitioner and co-accused entered into his house, behaved indecently with women and set the house on fire.

4. The main submissions advanced by petitioner's counsel are that as per the FIR, the alleged occurrence took place on 17.02.2024 and the FIR was registered on 29.02.2024 i.e. after an inordinate delay of 12 days without any plausible explanation and the alleged offence under section 307 of IPC is not made out against the petitioner and he has been falsely implicated by the informant in the present case at the instance of his co-villagers.

5. Learned APP for the State has opposed the bail prayer of the petitioner and submits that against the petitioner, there are two criminal antecedents and the informant remained under treatment at PMCH, Patna and the final medical opinion with regard to his injuries could not be given due to non-availability of the CT Scan report. It is further submitted that the petitioner firstly made extortion demand of Rs. 5,000/- from the informant and when his demand was not fulfilled then he proceeded to assault the informant and his daughter.



6. Considering the seriousness of the allegations appearing against the petitioner as pointed out by learned APP and also taking into account the petitioner’s criminal antecedents of two cases, coupled with informant’s injury report, this Court is not inclined to grant the relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, his prayer stands rejected.

(Shailendra Singh, J)

annu/-

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

