

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31739 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-125 Year-2025 Thana- TANKUPPA District- Gaya

RAMAKANT KUMAR S/o- Rajo Singh R/v- Paharpur Ps- Tankuppa Dist-
Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Ankita Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 09-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P., Mr. Rabindra Kumar for the State and learned counsel
appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 281/125,
(A)/125, (B)/324 and (2-6) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case as would manifest from the
pleading made in the supplementary affidavit, it is next
submitted that informant alleges that on 04.06.2025 at 6:00 AM,
her sons namely Santan and Ajeet were going to the Court on
motorcycle, when they were dashed by an unknown driver of a
Bolero vehicle near Bahera crossing and both suffered injury
and were admitted in a hospital and informant was informed by
a boy of Bahera village about the occurrence, the condition of



Santan is precarious.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR was against unknown and during the course of investigation, the name of the petitioner transpired along with his family members. It is submitted that petitioner and informant are agnates and are having dispute relating to property. It is further submitted that petitioner is a railway employee and presently is posted at Bengaluru and on the date of occurrence also the petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence rather was at Bengaluru as would manifest from his attendance register annexed as Annexure P/2. It is also submitted that during the course of investigation at Para 57 of the case diary, it has been recorded that tower location of the mobile of the petitioner was at Bengaluru. It is next submitted that name of the petitioner transpired based on the statement of Santan after nine days of the occurrence, wherein he disclosed that on orders of Shashikant, the driver of the Bolero vehicle dashed him and his brother. It is next submitted that Santan and Ajeet were going to the court in respect of a case instituted by Rajo Singh, father of the present petitioner. It is also submitted that petitioner is a government servant and is aware of the consequences which would entail, in the event, if he is involved in a criminal case.



5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner.

6. Learned counsel on behalf of the informant submits that petitioner has not approached the Court with clean hands. It is further submitted that initially when anticipatory bail application was filed at Para 3, it was pleaded that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent but subsequently a supplementary affidavit was filed where in it was pleaded that petitioner has antecedent of one case i.e., Gaya Muffasil PS Case No. 616 of 2021, when petitioner has antecedent of more than one case.

7. The learned APP for the State also opposes the anticipatory bail application but then fairly submits that at Para 57 of the case diary, it has come that tower location of the petitioner was at Bengaluru on the date of occurrence but then petitioner came to implicated in the instant case based on statement of injured Santan. It is further submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the



investigation to prove his innocence and will not tamper with the evidence.

8. 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 provisionally anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten 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 Tankuppa P.S. Case No. 125 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of BNSS.

9. It is made clear that thereafter the learned Trial Court shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in the event if it is found that petitioner has antecedent of more than one case, the provisional anticipatory bail order shall not be confirmed, but after verification if it is found that petitioner has antecedent of only one case in that event the provisional anticipatory bail order shall be confirmed forthwith.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

rajesh/-

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

