

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86175 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-469 Year-2025 Thana- DIGHA District- Patna

Ranjeet Kumar Ray @ Ranjeet Yadav @ Ranjit Ray @ Ranjeet Kumar Yadav
Son of Jay Nath Ray @ Jay Nath yadav Resident of village -Panapur Nav-
Diary, PS-Akilpur, District-Saran at present resident of Govt. School Gali,
PS- Digha, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Akhauri Kamal Kishore Sahay, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bharat Bhushan, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 20-01-2026 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 126(2),
115(2), 308(4), 324(4), 329(4), 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS,
2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of seven cases and the informant
alleges that he was inspecting the filling of road to Plot No. 785,
Khata No. 1428, Area 93 decimal belonging to Amrendradhari
Singh, further in the afternoon on 19.06.2025, the accused
persons including the petitioner came and threatened to stop the
work or else would be killed, further Mukesh and Ashok asked
the informant how is he carrying the work without paying
extortion.



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 from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that allegation of demanding extortion is against Mukesh and Ashok and as far as petitioner is concerned, the allegation against him is general and omnibus in nature.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that petitioner has antecedent of seven serious cases and in the event if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State and also taking into consideration the criminal antecedent of the petitioner, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

