

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48128 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-314 Year-2015 Thana- TEGHRHA District- Begusarai

Rampravesh Mahto, Male, aged about 55 years, S/O Bhuneshwar Mahto,
Resident of Nonpur, P.S.- Teghra, Dist.- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Alok Kumar Alok, Advocate and Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party	:	Mr. Ram Naresh Ray, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 29-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Teghra P.S. Case No. 314 of 2015 dated 20.10.2015 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 384, 386, 506, 120B read with Section 34 of the I.P.C. and Sections 17, 18 and 10 of the U.A.P. Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, on 20.10.2015 at about 6.00 A.M., the police got information that at 'Pakthaul Chowk', the F.I.R. named accused persons including the petitioner who are the members of 'Restricted Bhakpa Maobadi Organization' pasted some objectionable posters on the wall, in which statements against administration were written. After this



information, the informant with the police force reached there and saw that two posters were pasted on the wall of 'Pakthaul Chowk'. There was also written warning against Vido Jha, Janardan Yadav, Suresh Yadav and Raj Kumar Chaudhary. On spot, the informant seized the 'Parcha'. It is further alleged that the F.I.R. named accused persons are the members of 'Maobadi' have forcefully ploughed 44 kathas of land by the tractor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the petitioner has neither concern with any 'Maobadi Organization' nor with any unlawful activities. It is further submitted that during the course of investigation, regarding extortion, no any complain and the witnesses have not stated anything against the petitioner, hence, Sections 384, 386 and 506 of the I.P.C. is not made out against the petitioner. There is clear cut violation of law as per Section 45 and rule 3 and 4 of the U.A.P. Act, hence, Sections 17, 18 and 10 of the U.A.P. Act is not made out against the petitioner. The petitioner has clean antecedent as stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail application.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. It is



further stated that as per Section 43D(4) of U.A.P. Act, 1967 “nothing in Section 438 of the Code shall apply in relation to any case involving the arrest of any person accused of having committed an offence punishable under this Act.”

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected with a direction to the petitioner to surrender before the learned court below within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order and the learned court below may consider the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner without being prejudiced of the order of this Court in connection with Teghra P.S. Case No. 314 of 2015, pending in the court of learned C.J.M. Begusarai.

7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner stands rejected.

U.K./-

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

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

