

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.82483 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-153 Year-2024 Thana- SILAO District- Nalanda

Hare Ram Yadav @ Hare Ram Kumar Son of Chandra Deep Yadav R/V -
Keshari Bigha, p. s. -Silao, District -Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kumari Sujata Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Uday Pratap Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 19-04-2025 1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail,
arises out of Silao Police Station Case No. 153 of 2024,
disclosing offences under Sections 386, 387, 34 of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, on 11.05.2024 in the
afternoon, informant received a call on his mobile and the caller
demanded Rs. 10 lakhs from the informant saying that he was
earning handsome amount from his timber and property
business. The caller disclosed his name as Neta alias Nitish.
After some time, the petitioner along with other accused persons
named in the FIR came at the timber shop of the informant,
abused him and demanded Rs. 10 lakhs. It has further been



alleged that co-accused Ramesh Kumar at the gunpoint threatened to kill the informant and told him that if he would not pay Rs. 2 lakhs by tomorrow, he would be killed. On 27.06.2024, the informant gave Rs. 2 lakhs to them and on 27.06.2024, they again demanded Rs. 2 lakhs and threatened to kill if the demand would not be fulfilled till evening.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is having no criminal antecedent and has falsely been implicated in this case due to village rivalry. The allegation made in the FIR is fabricated and concocted and the petitioner has no concern with the occurrence.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the materials available on record including the FIR and the impugned order. It appears that the petitioner is named in the FIR. There is allegation of demand of extortion of Rs. 10 lakhs from the informant by putting him in the fear of death. It also appears that a sum of Rs. 2 lakhs was given by the informant to the accused persons. The co-accused in his confessional statement has disclosed the name of the petitioner also as one of his accomplices. The confessional statement of co-accused disclosing the name of the petitioner may be the basis for further investigation against the petitioner. The case is



at the stage of investigation and from perusal of the learned Sessions Judge’s order, it appears that the petitioner appears to be an active member of the criminal gang.

6. Considering the aforesaid discussion, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of anticipatory bail.

7. This application is, accordingly, rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

HarshPandey/-

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

