

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36413 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-283 Year-2023 Thana- MAGADH MEDICAL COLLEGE
District- Gaya

=====

Ravi Yadav @ Ravi Kumar S/o Bhuneshwar Yadav R/o Village - Paharpur @
Parahpur, PS - Magadh Medical, District - Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jagdhar Prasad, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 03-06-2026 The Court proceeding is being conducted through
virtual mode.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

3. The petitioner is apprehending arrest in connection
with Magadh Medical P.S. Case No. 283 of 2023, dated
08.06.2023, lodged under Sections 341, 323, 504, 324, 385, 448,
506 and 34 of the IPC and under Section 27 of the Arms Act,
pending before the Court of A.C.J.M. II, Gaya.

4. As per the prosecution, FIR has been lodged against
five named accused persons including the present petitioner,
with the allegation that all the accused persons forcibly entered
the house of the informant, started assaulting him, demanded



Rs. 20 lakhs as a ransom and also threatened that they would not permit him to create a boundary on the land. It has been further alleged that the co-accused, namely, Tannu Yadav, assaulted the informant, due to which he sustained injury on the head and subsequently became unconscious. Thereafter, all the accused persons fled away resorting firing in air.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. Counsel further submits that, due to intervention of the well-wishers, the parties have entered into a compromise. Counsel further submits that both parties are land brokers and on a petty issue, a scuffle took place between them. Counsel further submits that in the light of the compromise petition annexed as Annexure-P/2, the bail application of the petitioner may be considered. Counsel also submits that the criminal antecedent of the petitioner is not clean, as there are four criminal cases pending against him, and he is on bail in all those cases.

6. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that, from the contents of the FIR, it transpires that the allegations are grave in nature. Counsel further submits that the criminal antecedent of the petitioner is not clean, as there are four criminal cases pending



against him, out of which three cases relate to the Arms Act. Counsel further submits that the present case also relates to offence under the Arms Act, and involves allegations of ransom and threats to kill. During the scuffle, the informant also sustained an injury on his head.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

8. Liberty is hereby granted to the petitioner that if he surrenders within six weeks, the Trial Court is directed to pass order on his surrender-cum-bail application on the same day without being prejudiced by the fact that the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner has been rejected by this Court, and the Trial Court shall pass an order on the merits of the case.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Aman Kumar/-

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

