

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18777 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-280 Year-2024 Thana- RAJEPUR District- East Champaran

Ramesh Rai son of Late Sitaram Rai Resident of Village -Sahbajiya PS
-Rajepur Distt -East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Usha Kumari, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Mithlesh Kumar Khare, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Adv.
		Mr. Gyan Ranjan, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf
of the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109, 308(3), 303(2), 352, 351(2) of the B.N.S., 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of five cases and the informant alleges that on 18.12.2024 at 2 P.M. the accused persons including the petitioner came to his shop and started abusing, on protest, petitioner gave order to loot the shop and Naresh demanded extortion of Rs.5 lacs, thereafter accused persons looted the



shop and assaulted, further Navlesh assaulted his father by butt of pistol causing injury on nose and destroyed the CCTV camera and Raushan took Rs.30,000/- while Navlesh fired in the air when people gathered, the accused fled.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant with an allegation that the occurrence was committed on the order of the petitioner. It is next submitted that petitioner and the informant are agnates and are having dispute relating to property for which a Title Suit No.718 of 2024 is pending adjudication in between the parties at District Court, Motihari. It is next submitted that though petitioner and the informant are related but then from perusal of the FIR, it would manifest that informant for reasons best known has not disclosed his relationship with the petitioner rather has given an impression that criminal came to his shop with an intent to loot. It is also submitted that no doubt the petitioner has antecedent but then facts of the case also requires to be appreciated. It is next submitted that deliberately it has been alleged in the FIR that accused damaged the CCTV, the said allegation has been levelled only with a view to implicate the petitioner along with others based on oral allegation.



5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner but then the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner and the informant are agnates and are having dispute relating to property and the said relationship is not disclosed in the FIR.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Rajepur P.S. Case No.280/2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section (2) B.N.S.S.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

