

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1150 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-298 Year-2025 Thana- MASAUDHI District- Patna

Bholi Yadav @ Ravi Ranjan Kumar S/o Ram Nath Prasad Resident of Village
- Tarpura A/P - Shyam Bhawan Yadvesh Market, P.S.- Masaurhi, District-
Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Sri Krishna Prasad Singh, Sr. Advocate

Sri Saket Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Sri Rabindra Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 27-04-2026 1. Heard Sri Krishna Prasad Singh, learned Senior
Counsel for the petitioner and Sri Rabindra Kumar, learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1) and
61(2) of the BNS as well as Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits
that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the
informant alleges that his nephew was shot dead by unknown
criminals.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits
that the FIR was against unknown. It is further submitted that
petitioner earlier was working with the Merchant Navy but had
to quit the job on account of health issues. It is next submitted



that petitioner is preparing for teachers competitive examination. It is also submitted that the wife of the petitioner represented before the higher police officials to get the case investigated in its correct perspective as the petitioner came to be implicated based on the confessional statement of apprehended accused. It is further submitted that Sunny Kumar who claims to be an eyewitness to the occurrence did not name the petitioner nor disclosed the name of any of the accused persons but in course of investigation, he divulged the name of three accused who were arrested and based on the confessional statement of apprehended accused, the name of the petitioner transpired. It is submitted that petitioner is not a land broker.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that nephew of the informant was killed by unknown accused and the FIR was instituted against unknown and the name of the petitioner transpired, during the course of investigation, based on the confessional statement of apprehended accused. It is further submitted that investigation is continuing and if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond. It is next submitted that similarly situated co-accused,



Gyan Ranjan @ Gyan Ranjan Chaudhary had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No. 53638 of 2025 and the same came to be rejected vide order dated 20.08.2025 by this Court.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is in complete agreement with the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, as such, is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Masaurhi P.S. Case No. 298 of 2025 pending in the Court of learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Masaurhi, Patna /Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

