

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74335 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-59 Year-2025 Thana- BARHAT District- Jamui

Vikash kumar Ranjan @ Vikash Kumar Son of Onkar Das Resident of Village
- Mahanpur, P.S.- Laxmipur, District – Jamui.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satya Prakash Parasar, Advocate.

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 18-11-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State Mr. Rabindra Kumar.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Barhat P.S. Case No.59/2025, registered for the offences
punishable under Section 140(2) of the B.N.S., 2023.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that he received secret information that 5-6 accused have
abducted a person for ransom, accordingly, he reached the place
of occurrence, from where three accused were apprehended
along with an injured, the apprehended accused disclosed their



name as Pratap, Subodh and Vikash, while injured disclosed his name as Gautam and further disclosed that he knows Monu and Vikash for the last 4-5 months, further on 23.04.2025 he came to Jamui and stayed with Monu and on 26.04.2025 he along with Monu, Guddu and Vikash went for travelling but they brought him to a garden where five accused were present from before and were introduced by Monu as Pratap, Sonu, Subodh, Vikash-2 and Khatri and thereafter Pratap and Sonu started assaulting him and snatched his mobile and Sonu assaulted him by danda causing injury on head and Pratap asked him to arrange Rs.10 lacs or else he would be killed and the accused snatched Rs.800/- from his pocket and got Rs.2000/- transferred from his Google Pay to Pratap's mobile and also transferred Rs.180/- in Pratap's mobile, thereafter Pratap called his brother from his (injured) mobile and demanded Rs.10 lacs but police came and three accused were arrested.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the injured without disclosing his parentage when the injured in the FIR himself discloses that he was knowing Monu and Vikash from before but then also disclosed that he is not aware the parentage of Vikash. It is next submitted that from perusal of the



allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that no specific allegation of assault or demanding extortion is alleged against the petitioner rather the thrust of the allegation is against Monu, Subodh, Pratap and Vikash-2. It is next submitted that Vikash-2 was arrested and he was granted the privilege of regular bail by this Court.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State Mr. Rabindra Kumar vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that it is a case of demanding extortion. It is next submitted that injured himself disclosed before the police that he was knowing Monu and the present petitioner but then was not aware of his father's name as such it cannot be said that petitioner has been falsely implicated. It is also submitted that from perusal of the pleading made in the anticipatory bail application, it would manifest that the same does not even remotely suggest that as to what the petitioner does. It is also submitted that investigation in the case is in its nascent stages and the injured along with his brother have supported the allegation of demand of extortion.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is
rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

