

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24939 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-11 Year-2026 Thana- VISHAMBHARPUR District- Gopalganj

Ranjay Yadav Son of Gajadhar Prasad Yadav, Resident of Village- Khem
Matihania, P.S.- Bhisambharpur, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Adesh Raj Singh, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Kumar Veerendra Narayan, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

2 24-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. In the present case, the petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Bhisambharpur P.S. Case No. 11 of 2026, dated 27.01.2026, registered for the offence punishable under Section 308(5) read with Section 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. As per prosecution case, petitioner and co-accused came at the sugarcane centre of the informant and demanded rupees five lakhs as extortion money. When the informant refused, they fired upon him and the informant somehow managed to save his life.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. No occurrence in the manner as alleged has ever taken place. The FIR has been lodged after a delay of four days without any satisfactory explanation and it creates doubt over the prosecution



story. Petitioner has been implicated due to personal enmity. Petitioner and informant are co-villagers and there is pending land dispute between them. No money or valuable security has been received by the petitioner, hence no offence under Section 308(5) of the B.N.S., 2023 is made out against the petitioner. The petitioner is having antecedent of three cases and he is on bail in all the said cases.

5. Learned APP opposes the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner and submits that shell casing was recovered from the spot and the same has been sent for FSL examination. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner appears to be a habitual offender and has been in custody in a number of cases.

6. Having regards to the nature of allegation that petitioner is said to have fired upon the informant on account of some demand and also considering the criminal antecedent of the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer of anticipatory bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

Shahnawaz/-

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

