

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.71859 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-176 Year-2025 Thana- SIKANDRA District- Jamui

-
1. Vikash Kumar @ Vikash Yadav S/o Baijnath Yadav R/o Vill.- Rajadih, P.S.- Sikandra, District- Jamui
 2. Nitish Kumar @ Bhothla Yadav @ Bhotla Yadav S/O Darogi Yadav R/o Vill.- Rajadih, P.S.- Sikandra, District- Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shahabuddin Azeem @ S. Azeem, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 16-10-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Sikandra P.S. Case No. 176 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 109(1), 351(2), 303(2), 324(4) and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on 22.05.2025, he had gone to make payment to labourers who were engaged in road construction work of Pathak Chak Road, when unknown accused persons came and demanded extortion and also brutally assaulted causing fracture



of hand and shoulder and also assaulted by rod causing injury on head and snatched Rs. 33,000/- which he was carrying and also damaged his motorcycle and demanded extortion of Rs. 5 Lakhs, on hearing hue and cry villagers came and informed his parents and thereafter the informant was admitted in a government hospital where his X-ray and CT scan was done, next alleges that petitioners had earlier threatened for extortion.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the informant alleges that petitioners earlier had demanded extortion from him, but then no case came to be instituted. It is next submitted that it is not the case of the informant that petitioners assaulted him rather it is alleged that unknown accused persons came and assaulted him brutally.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that from perusal of the order impugned, it appears that the injury suffered by the informant has been opined to be grievous, which amply demonstrates that the informant was brutally assaulted. It is next submitted that there is specific allegation in the FIR that



petitioners had demanded extortion from the informant and subsequently the occurrence was committed. It is next submitted that investigation in the case is continuing and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioners, the petitioners may abscond.

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

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

