

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4573 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-253 Year-2024 Thana- BHARGAMA District- Araria

Nitish Kumar Yadav @ Nitish Kumar S/o Krishna Kumar Yadav Resident of
village - Shankarpur, ward no. 1, P.S.- Bhargama, Distt.- Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mukesh Kumar Rana

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Murli Dhar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Bhargama P.S. Case No.253/2024, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 109, 126, 333, 324,
191(2) and 190 of the B.N.S., 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms
Act. Later on Sections 25(1-b)a, 26 of the Arms Act was added.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that seven accused on three motorcycles came and
demanded extortion of Rs. 2 lacs and also assaulted him and
Bablu and Kunal snatched Rs.17,000/- from Bablu and also
fired at the place of occurrence.

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



allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that no specific allegation of demand of dowry, snatching and firing is alleged against the petitioner. It is also submitted that petitioner is a student.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that it is a case of extortion and the informant specifically alleges that the named accused persons including the petitioner came to the site where the construction was going on and demanded extortion and thereafter committed the occurrence as alleged in the FIR. It is also submitted that no doubt it has been pleaded that petitioner is a student but then no documentary evidence is on record to substantiate that petitioner is a student. It is next submitted that of late in State of Bihar such kind of occurrences are taking place with impunity and investigation in the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

