

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.87726 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-654 Year-2024 Thana- RAJIVNAGAR District- Patna

Ratnesh Kumar @ Ratnesh Rai @ Ratnesh S/o- Ganeshi Yadav @ Ganesh Rai Resident of Jai Prakash Nagar Saket Bhawan Road no 1 PS- Rajiv Nagar District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jai Kishore Sharma

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Jitendra Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 07-02-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Rajiv Nagar P.S. Case No. 654 of 2024 dated 28.10.2024 registered for the offence under Section 109, 352, 351(3), 3(5) of the B.N.S. Act, 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959.

3. As per the first information report on 28.10.2024 at around 8:15 P.M. while the informant was sitting at the shop namely, Vijay Traders, in the meantime, the petitioner– Ratnesh Kumar along with friend co-accused / Pankaj Sharma arrived there, inquired about Vijay and when the informant asked for the reason, they started abusing, which was objected by the



informant, upon which Pankaj Sharma ordered Ratnesh (petitioner) to shoot him and the petitioner opened fire but the informant somehow managed to save his life. The accused persons fled away from the scene of occurrence giving threatening of dire consequences. The informant stated that the entire incident got captured in the C.C.T.V. camera installed in the shop and the Police has also found one bullet shell and one live cartridge from the place of occurrence.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence in the manner alleged. The petitioner and the informant are neighbours and both run shop of stone chips and due to business rivalry the informant has falsely implicated the petitioner with a view to ruin his business.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that the learned Additional Sessions Judge-XIII, Patna while refusing the prayer for anticipatory bail has taken note of the fact that prosecution witnesses in paragraph nos. 3, 7, 8 & 9 of the case diary has fully supported the prosecution version.

6. Regard being had to the submission made by the parties, taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner has been



seen in the C.C.T.V. footage and he is having four criminal antecedents, as such, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The same is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

praful/-

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

