

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49804 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-99 Year-2025 Thana- RATANPUR District- Supaul

Ramratan Ray @ Ram Ratan Roy Son of Sahdeo Ray @ Kailu Ray @ Sahdeo Roy Resident of Village- Piprahi, Ward No. 1, P.S.- Ratanpura, District- Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjay Kumar Singh, Adv.

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 29-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

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), 117(2), 109, 132, 121, 122, 262, 263, 351, 351(2) and 351(3) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of six cases and the informant alleges that on 20.12.2025 at 2:15 AM, the police team raided the house of petitioner in connection with Ratanpura PS Case No. 88 of 2025 and petitioner was apprehended when eight named accused persons came and assaulted the police force by stick, rod and sharp edged weapon causing injury to police personnel



and the informant suffered injury on nose and Raushan, brother of petitioner made him flee.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is next submitted that petitioner was not even present at the place of occurrence when the police reached the place of occurrence and since petitioner was made an accused in Ratanpura PS Case No. 88 of 2025, as such, he came to be implicated in the instant case by the informant with false allegations. It is also submitted no doubt police had come to the house of the petitioner and since petitioner was not found in the house, hence the police personnel assaulted his family members and thereafter falsely implicated them along with the petitioner in the instant case.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and submits that petitioner has antecedent of six cases and the informant specifically alleges that petitioner was apprehended, but then his family members assaulted the police personnel and his brother Raushan made him flee and in the assault police personnel including the informant suffered injury. It is next submitted that if in a case like the present one, privilege of anticipatory bail is



granted that will have the impact of lowering the morale of the police.

6. Considering the submission made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

rajesh/-

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

