

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.71725 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-107 Year-2025 Thana- RAGHOPUR District- Vaishali

Ramparvesh Rai Son of Tipu Rai Resident of Village - Hematpur, Ps-
Rustampur, Op, Dist- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravish Mishra, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Suman Kumari Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-10-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2),
191(3), 126, 115(2), 118, 109, 132, 352 and 351(3) of the BNS,
2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the informant alleges
that the police force had gone to arrest Vijay Rai and Laldev Rai
on allegation of storing liquor, accordingly Laldev Rai was
arrested, but 11 named accused persons including the petitioner
along with 5-6 unknown accused came and attacked the raiding
team, further Bijli Rai assaulted SI, Deepak with lathi on his
right hand, and Sanjeet assaulted by brick on his forehead



causing injury with an intention to free Laldev Rai further Laldev Rai, Dinesh and Umesh assaulted Bhagwan Lal Bhagat by stick and brick causing injury, while Vijay Rai assaulted constable, Sangam by an iron rod causing injury on head, but somehow the force managed to save their lives and the accused Laldev and Dinesh were brought to police station.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case being nephew of Laldev Rai. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that petitioner is not alleged to have assaulted when the informant has specifically named the accused persons who assaulted the members of the raiding team. It is also submitted that specific allegation of assault is against the named accused persons. It is next submitted that petitioner though has antecedent of two cases, but then does not have antecedent with regard to liquor case, it is thus submitted that when petitioner is not involved in liquor trade, why would he be present at the place of occurrence to save Laldev Rai.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail application and submits that in the event if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the



petitioner, it may send an impression across the society that it is easy to get anticipatory bail even after assaulting the police force who are discharging their duties. It is also submitted that it is not that only one police personnel was assaulted rather several police personnel were assaulted including SI, Deepak. It is next submitted that no doubt petitioner is not alleged to have assaulted, but then his presence at the place of occurrence emboldened the other accused to commit the occurrence. It is further submitted that investigation in the case is continuing and petitioner has antecedent of two cases and in the event if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner 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 petitioner.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

