

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19670 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-179 Year-2026 Thana- KATIHAR NAGAR District- Katihar

Ravi Jha Son of Late Jaldhar Jha Resident of Village- Govindpur, P.S.-
Rautara, District- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vivekanand Singh, Advocate Mr. Naveen Kumar, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Abhishek Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Suresh Prasad Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 04-05-2026 Heard Mr. Vivekanand Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner; Mr. Abhishek Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the informant and Mr. Suresh Prasad Singh, learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in connection with Katihar Town P.S. Case No. 179 of 2026, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 126(2), 127, 119, 308, 115(2), 118(2), 308(3), 122, 303(2), 109, 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. As per the allegation made in the FIR, the informant had entered into an agreement in 2023 for purchase of 17 acres of land from Dulal Kant Nandi, and on 09.02.2026, while returning from Circle Office, Hasanganj, the petitioner



along with associates intercepted their vehicle and forcibly entered it at gunpoint. It is alleged that they abducted the informant, took him to a farmhouse, restrained and assaulted him, causing multiple injuries. Under threat of death, the informant and the landowner were allegedly forced to sign blank papers and a backdated stamp paper. The accused persons are further alleged to have acted with intent to grab the land and also snatched Rs. 25,000/- from the informant. Due to fear, the informant claims he handed over original documents and wrote receipt of Rs. 1.30 crore, and after escaping, he sought medical treatment and lodged the case on 11.02.2026.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Learned counsel further submitted that before the process under Sections 83 and 84 BNSS was issued by the learned District Court declaring the petitioner proclaimed offender, the petitioner was granted interim protection by this Court vide order dated 08.04.2026, as such, the subsequent order of the learned District Court should not come in a way to deprive the petitioner of his personal liberty considering that the offence, which has been alleged in the FIR, don't come within the purview of organized crime in



accordance with the provision of Section 111 of the BNS. Learned counsel further submitted that petitioner has been acquitted in 7 cases out of 12 cases. On these grounds, petitioner seeks to be released on pre-arrest bail.

5. *Per contra*, Mr. Abhishek Kumar Pandey, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submitted that petitioner is involved in almost twelve cases though, he has been acquitted in many of those cases, but, so far as, the conduct of the petitioner is concerned, in spite of having granted interim protection by this Court, he has not cooperated in course of investigation, as such, the learned District Court, in accordance with law and established procedure, has issued process under Sections 83 and 84 of the BNSS as would appear from paragraph no. 224 of the case diary.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has also vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

7. Having heard the rival submissions made on behalf of the parties and also considering the information contained in paragraph no. 224 of the case diary, without going into the merits of the allegation made in the FIR, in view of settled principle of law that once the process under Sections 83 and 84



has been issued, the Court must restrain from granting pre-arrest bail, moreover, in the present case, the informant has given information that altogether 12 criminal cases are registered against the petitioner and the investigation is still going on, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on pre-arrest bail.

8. Accordingly, the present bail application stands dismissed.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Niraj/-

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

