

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.90749 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-206 Year-2025 Thana- RANIYATALAB District- Patna

=====

Ranjan Kumar @ Billa S/O Dinesh Rai @ Dinesh Ray R/O Vill.- Srirampur
Tola,P.S- Bihta, Dist- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Muskan Singh, Adv. Ms. Ruby, Adv.
For the Informant	:	Ms. Purna Rishi, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Uday Pratap Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 20-02-2026 Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Rani Talab P.S. Case No. 206 of 2025 registered for the offence(s) under Section(s) 109 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (B.N.S.).

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant has stated that during a cricket match, some unknown criminals



opened indiscriminate firing, thereby causing injuries to three persons, namely, Anjani Singh, Dharmendra Kumar and Viswajeet Kumar. It has been alleged that all the three persons were referred to Patna for better treatment and the FIR was registered against unknown.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated at the behest of the police. It has been submitted that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and his name has surfaced in the confessional statement of one Santosh Kumar, a co-accused, which does not have any evidentiary value. It has further been submitted that there is no specific allegation against the petitioner rather his name is based on suspicion. It has also been submitted that from the perusal of the case diary, it would be evident that the injured persons had not named the petitioner to have fired, in fact, in the viral video of the injured/Anjani Kumar, it has come to surface that he has named two persons, namely, Ganauri Yadav and Rajesh Yadav to have fired upon him at the behest of the MLA. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedent.

5. The learned A.P.P. for the State as also the learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer



for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and have submitted that the petitioner was present at the place of occurrence and was sated to be an accompish of co-accused/Santosh Kumar, who was apprehended by the police during the course of investigation and he has specifically named the petitioner. It has further been submitted that it is very pre-mature stage and if the petitioner granted bail, he shall disrupt the further investigation.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, let the petitioner, above-named, be released on anticipatory bail, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the concerned Court/successor Court within a period of four weeks from today, on his furnishing bail bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the concerned Court/successor Court where the case is pending in connection with Rani Talab P.S. Case No. 206 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 read with corresponding Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (B.N.S.S.) as well as subject to the following conditions :

- (i) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his



close relative and the other shall be a local resident.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present before the concerned Court on each and every date of the trial and shall cooperate in the investigation and if it is found that he is trying to evade, the prosecution shall be at liberty to take necessary action.

(iii) In case of absence for two consecutive occasions or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the concerned Court.

(iv) If the petitioner, in future, is found to be involved in similar nature of offence(s), the prosecution shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of his bail bond.

(v) The concerned Court shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case, at any stage, it is found that he has concealed his criminal antecedent, the Court concerned shall take necessary steps for cancellation of his bail bond. However, the acceptance of bail bond in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

7. It is made clear that the observations, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

8. The application stands allowed.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Praveen-II/-

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

