

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53726 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-177 Year-2025 Thana- NAUTAN District- West Champaran

1. Ranjeet Kumar @ Ranjeet Sah S/o- Late Rajendra Sah @ Late Rajendra Prasad Village- Shivrajpur Police station- Nautan District-West Champaran
2. Laddu Kumar @ Pawan Kumar S/o- Kushan Mahto @ Krishna Mahto Village- Shivrajpur Police station- Nautan District-West Champaran
3. Santosh Kumar @ Santosh Sah S/o- Jiut Sah @ Jyoti Sah Village- Belbanwa Ps- Yogapatti Dist- West Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Brij Kishor Mishra
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Jitendra Kumar Singh, APP
	Mr. Kundan Kumar Ojha, Adv

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 20-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant.
2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 109, 308(2), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, at the outset, submits that petitioner No. 1, Ranjeet Kumar @ Ranjeet Sah, has not approached this court with clean hands. It is next submitted that at Para-3 of the anticipatory bail application, it has been pleaded that petitioners are persons with



clean antecedent but then against Ranjeet Kumar @ Ranjeet Sah, one criminal case has been instituted i.e., Nautan PS Case No. 215 of 2025.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that the accused persons on 15-4-2025 at 8 PM abducted his father and took him to South Telua, where 10 unknown accused were present from before and they started demanding Rs. 50,000/- from his father, and even called at home and demanded the money and when money was not paid, they assaulted his father by knife, *lathi* and *danda*, and thereafter fled after throwing him at Mangalpur Dhaba, further his father called from the *Dhaba* when police was informed and he was taken to hospital.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that it does not appear probable that informant, even after knowing that his father has been abducted and extortion is being demanded, would not have approached the police instantly. It is next submitted that date of occurrence is 15-4-2025, and the FIR



came to be instituted on 17-4-2025. It is also submitted that even allegation of assault is not specific, rather the allegation is general and omnibus in nature.

6. The learned APP and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the anticipatory bail application but then are not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners that the FIR was not instituted instantly, despite informant being aware that his father has been abducted and extortion is being demanded.

7. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.

8. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on **provisional anticipatory bail** on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Hundred) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Nutan P.S. Case No. 177 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section Section 482(2) of the BNSS.



9. It is made clear that thereafter the learned Trial Court shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners and in the event if it is found that petitioners have antecedent of even one case then it would be presumed that petitioners, for the purposes of seeking anticipatory bail, had concealed their antecedent before this Court, as such, the provisional anticipatory bail order shall not be confirmed with respect to that petitioner against whom criminal antecedent is found, but after verification if it is found that petitioners are person with clean antecedent in that event the provisional anticipatory bail order shall be confirmed forthwith.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

