

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15188 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-11 Year-2007 Thana- TEKARI District- Gaya

Ramdahin Saw @ Rakesh, S/O Late Ranju Saw, R/O Village - Mahadipur,
PS- Uphara, District - Aurangabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Durgesh Nandan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Dr. Ajeet Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

4 13-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Tekari P.S. Case no.11 of 2007 registered under sections 384, 385, 386 and 323 of the Indian Penal Code and sections 25(1-B)(a) and 35 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that having received secret information about the members of MCC having assembled in the house of Gaurav, it is stated that a raid was conducted and Sudhir @ Gaurav was arrested. Incriminating articles including *purchas* etc. were recovered. The accused who was arrested namely Sudhir @ Gaurav confessed to have committed various crimes of threats, extortion, stopping of public work etc. and of having passed on the proceeds thereof to this petitioner.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. The only material against him is the statement of a co-accused made before police. No incriminating article has been recovered from the petitioner's possession and large number of co-accused as stated in paragraph no.13 have been enlarged on bail. Though the petitioner has criminal antecedents but he has been acquitted in one case and is on bail in the two others. The petitioner is in custody since 16.8.2025 and charge-sheet has been submitted in the case. He undertakes to cooperate in the investigation/trial.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegation against the petitioner in the F.I.R. together with the fact that in a case registered in the year 2007, the petitioner continued to abscond for 18 years till he was taken into custody in 2025, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

avinash/-

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

