

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23196 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-338 Year-2025 Thana- PATLIPUTRA District- Patna

Namit Sinha @ Sunny @ Namit Kumar Sinha Son of Madan Prasad @
Madan Prasad Sinha Resident of NTPC Colony, P.S. - Ramkrishna Nagar,
Dist. - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Allama Abdul Quadir Jamal Faridi, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

2 10-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Patliputra P.S. Case No. 338 of 2025 in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 352, 351(2), 308(4) of the BNS.

3. As per the prosecution story, the petitioner is said to have demanded Rs. 45 lakhs as extortion money from informant's son and brother by threatening them. It is further alleged that on objection, the petitioner abused them and also threatened them to falsely implicate them in molestation case.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, submits that there is delay of ten days in lodging of the FIR



inasmuch as he stated that it is from 02.08.2025 that the present petitioner was calling the informant and demanding money. It is further submitted that both the parties were in contractual agreement earlier, and on account of some violation in the terms and conditions, the relationship between them became strained and cases were filed by both the sides against each other. A money suit was also filed by the informant against the petitioner and upon a case bearing Danapur P.S. Case No. 465 of 2025 filed by the petitioner's wife against the present informant, in retaliation, another case bearing Danapur P.S. Case No. 466 of 2025 was filed against the wife of the present petitioner. It is thus, submitted that there are allegations and counter allegations and the dispute with regard to some money transaction in the business, the petitioner has been falsely attributed the allegation of extortion.

5. Learned APP for the State has opposed the application for anticipatory bail.

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances and also considering the delay in the FIR coupled with the background of a money dispute between the parties, let the above named petitioner, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four



weeks from today, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Patliputra P.S. Case No. 338 of 2025, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the B.N.S.S., subject to the conditions that:

(I) One of the bailors will be a family member/close relative.

(II) The petitioner shall cooperate in the investigation/trial and in case of non-cooperation, the prosecution would be at liberty to move an application for cancelling the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

priyanka/-

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

