

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.79718 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-12 Year-2021 Thana- GOVINDGANJ District- East Champaran

Adarsh Baitha @ Adarsh Kumar Son of Parmeshwar Baitha Resident of
Village- Koini Babu Tola, P.S.- Majhagadh, District- Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Abhishek Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Sharma

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 08-12-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Govindganj PS Case No. 12 of 2021 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 386, 387, 504, 506 and 34 of
the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the informant alleges
that accused persons including the petitioner on 6-7-2021 at
6:40 PM, came to his work place and on point of gun demanded
extortion of Rs. 7 lakh, further extortion was demanded by
mobile also by calling on his mobile number as disclosed in the
FIR, further accused persons on several occasions had come to
the work place and threatened the labourers on point of pistol



and indulged in committing theft of electric wire repeatedly.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that allegation of demand of extortion is general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that though it is alleged that extortion was demanded by calling the informant on mobile, but then it is not alleged that it was the petitioner who had called. It is also submitted that mobile number from which the extortion calls used to come to the informant, as disclosed in the FIR, does not belong to the petitioner.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that allegation is of demanding extortion by calling also and the informant also alleges that accused persons have committed theft of electric wire repeatedly, which obviously hampers the business, it is next submitted that 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 submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory



bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

