

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14883 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-229 Year-2025 Thana- LAHERIMUHALLA District- Nalanda

Ravi Kumar Son of Rajnish Prasad Resident of Village- Barith, P.S.-
Katrisarai, District- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Nandu Kumar Yadav, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Abhay Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 29-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Laheri P.S. case no. 229 of 2025 registered for the offence under Sections 316(2), 303(2), 319(2) 318(4) 336(3)/ 338, / 340(2) / 61(2), 3(5) of BNS and 66, 66(D) of IT Act 2000.

3. The prosecution's case, in brief, is that upon arriving near Chora Bagicha at the Kargil Bus Stand, they observed two individuals who attempted to flee. After a chase, the police apprehended one individual, identified as Ankit Kumar. A search of his person yielded a mobile phone, two ATM cards, and ₹17,500 in cash. During an inspection of his phone at the police station, a transaction of ₹29,900 to an account belonging to Ravi Kumar was discovered. Ankit Kumar allegedly confessed to committing cyber fraud alongside the



petitioner, Ravi Kumar. He further disclosed that they deceived innocent victims, withdrew illicit funds using fraudulent ATM cards, and transferred the proceeds to Ravi Kumar via PhonePe. Accordingly, the FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not committed any offence and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that although the petitioner has one criminal antecedent Giriyak (Katrisarai) P.S. Case No. 196 of 2025 he is currently on bail in that matter. The counsel contends that the prosecution's allegations in the present case are entirely false, absurd, and concocted. Furthermore, learned counsel submits that no incriminating material was recovered from the person or possession of the petitioner, who is merely a victim of misrepresented facts. Finally, it is argued that the seizure list was not prepared in accordance with the provisions of Section 105 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, and that the police investigation has failed to uncover any direct or indirect evidence against the petitioner.

5. The learned APP opposes the anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the seriousness of the allegation



levelled against the petitioner of being involved in crime of cyber fraud with Innocent people, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is rejected.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

Prakash Narayan

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

