



COURT OF DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, BHOJPUR, ARA

**Anticipatory Bail Petition no. 203/2026
(Arising out of Barhara P.S Case FIR No. 238 of 2025)**

Vimal Ray & Others

Petitioner

Versus

State of Bihar

Opp. Party

Date of order or proceeding	Order with signature of the court	Office action taken with date
04.04.2026	1. This Anticipatory bail petition has been filed on behalf of petitioners namely, 1. Vimal Ray @ Pintu Ray @ Pintu Kumar, 2. Dara Yadav @ Dara @ Anil Ray and 3. Guru Ray @ Srikant Yada, who are apprehending their arrest in connection with Barhara P.S. case no. 238/2025 u/ss. 191(2), 191(1), 126(2), 115(2), 110, 303(2), 352, 351 of B.N.S, put up for hearing. 2. Heard Shri Bishnudhar Pandey, Learned Counsel for petitioner as well as the learned P.P Sri. Rana Pratap Singh for the state. 3. As per the case of the prosecution that on 28.12.2025 at about 10:00 A.M. when son of the informant was playing cricket at playground in the meantime accused Vimal Ray @ Pintu Ray @ Pintu Kumar came their riding on motorcycle and drive rashly in the playground and when objection made by informant's son and other then Vimal Ray @ Pintu Ray @ Pintu Kumar threaten them with dire consequences again after 10 minutes all the FIR named accused persons including the petitioners armed with lathi, danda and iron rod came their and started	



COURT OF DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, BHOJPUR, ARA

**Anticipatory Bail Petition no. 203/2026
(Arising out of Barhara P.S Case FIR No. 238 of 2025)**

Cont. 04.04.2026	assaulting due to which informant's son and other person caused injury. It is alleged that accused Vimal Ray @ Pintu Ray @ Pintu Kumar snatched golden locket from the informant's son and threaten them with dire consequences. 4. Learned counsel for petitioners submitted that petitioners are innocent and committed no offence rather they have been falsely implicated in this case. It has further been submitted that the petitioners are falsely implicated in this case out of previous enmity, hence, anticipatory bail petition of petitioners may be allowed. 5. On the contrary learned P.P. opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that petitioner and other co-accused persons mercilessly beaten the informant's son and other persons. There is specific allegation against the petitioners, hence, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required and bail petition of petitioners may be devoid of merit and same should be dismissed. 6. I have heard the rival submissions of both parties and perused the case record. Accused persons mercilessly beaten in full public view for opposing over speeding of vehicle and in full public view accused persons mercilessly beaten Sumit Kumar and Kunal Kumar injury report on	
---------------------	--	--



COURT OF DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, BHOJPUR, ARA

**Anticipatory Bail Petition no. 203/2026
(Arising out of Barhara P.S Case FIR No. 238 of 2025)**

Cont. 04.04.2026	record corroborates the case, petitioners are not man of clean antecedents. Petitioner no. 1 has bee implicated in two cases, petitioner no. 2 has been implicated in three cases and petitioner no. 3 has been implicated in three cases. 7. Considering the criminal antecedents of petitioners and in full public view accused persons mercilessly beaten and allegation made against them corroborated in toto and there are genuine chances that accused persons/petitioners herein may unduly influence witnesses not to make statement before Investigating Officer or make false statement and they may derail the trial, hence bail petition of the petitioner 1. Vimal Ray @ Pintu Ray @ Pintu Kumar, 2. Dara Yadav @ Dara @ Anil Ray and 3. Guru Ray @ Srikant Yada, against whom allegation is corroborated by injury report is dismissed. (Dictated & corrected by me) Sd/- (Purushottam Mishra) Sessions Judge. 04.04.2026	