

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15488 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-26 Year-2026 Thana- PANDARAK District- Patna

Ranvir Singh Yadav @ Ranbir Kumar Son of Late Ram Bilash Prasad
Resident of Village - Gulab Bag, P.S. - Barh, Dist. - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ashok Kumar Jha
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ajay Mishra

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 24-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in Pandarak P. S. Case No.26 of 2026 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 308(4),
103(1), 109(1), 3(5) of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of the Arms
Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has antecedent of sixteen cases as would manifest
from the supplementary affidavit, but then, petitioner was
acquitted in ten cases, as such, as of now petitioner has
antecedent of six cases and the informant alleges that his son
with Nityanand were going on a motorcycle when they were
intercepted by five named accused persons excluding the



petitioner and accused persons said despite extortion amount of Rs. Five lacs demanded by the petitioner, the same has not been given, on objection by his son Dharmraj, fired causing injury on head, thereafter Ashok fired causing injury on chest, but Nityanand managed to flee and when his son fell the accused persons assaulted him by bricks on his face and informed the petitioner that victim has been killed. Further, Nityanand disclosed about the occurrence, thus alleges that petitioner along with Karambir got his son killed.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence and came to be implicated by the informant who is not an eye witness to the occurrence rather based on disclosure made by Nitayanand, the FIR was instituted with the aforesaid allegation. It is further submitted that even presuming what has been alleged is true without admitting, then petitioner is not the assailant of the deceased rather specific allegation of causing firearm injury to the deceased is against Dharmraj and Ashok.

5. Learned A.P.P. vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that petitioner as of now has antecedent of six cases. It is also submitted that it does not appear probable that informant being father would have falsely



implicated the petitioner until the same was disclosed by Nityanand. It is also submitted that what is not in dispute rather stands admitting that son of the informant was killed and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. and also taking into consideration the antecedent of the petitioner, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

