

**IN THE COURT OF 1st ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE CUM SPECIAL
JUDGE SCHEDULE CASTE / SCHEDULE TRIBE ACT, BHOJPUR AT ARA
Anticipatory Bail Petition No.-576/2026
(Arising out of Koilwar P.S. Case No.470/2018)**

Vinod Kumar Prasad, aged about 40 years, S/o Sudama Prasad, R/o Vill- Birampur,
P.S.- Koilwar, District- Bhojpur.

.....Accused/Petitioner

Vs

The State of Bihar

.....Opposite Party

ORDER

13.03.2026

This anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of accused/petitioner namely Vinod Kumar Prasad who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Koilwar P.S. Case No.- 470/2018, registered U/s 406, 420, 341, 504, 34 of IPC and section 3(1)(s) of SC/ST Act.

Ld. Counsel on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence and he is falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that neither anticipatory bail nor regular bail petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner either in this learned court or in the Hon'ble High Court, Patna prior to this petition. The petitioner and his family did not have any familiar relationship with informant nor they visit each other's house. The petitioner is a gentle person and he is an auto rickshaw driver, who works hard to support and maintain his family. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent at all. Therefore, A.B.P. of the petitioner may be allowed.

The Ld. Spl. P.P. has vehemently opposed the bail petition and says that the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail as not maintainable.

The prosecution story in short as per the complaint petition of complainant Devmuni Paswan is that the accused persons had taken a sum of Rs.4,12,000/- from him by way of Hathpher for the purpose of business and personal work. On 11.10.2017, in the presence of witnesses, the complainant handed over the said amount to Binod Prasad. Binod Prasad along with other co-accused persons kept the money and assure to return within six months. However, after the expiry of six months, when the complainant demanded the return of the money, the accused persons refused to pay the same. It is further alleged that they assaulted the complainant by slaps and fists, abused him by using caste-indicative words and threatened him.

Heard both the Ld. Counsel. Perused the entire case record and case diary. Upon perusal of case record, it transpires that on the basis of complaint petition, police registered the case U/s 406, 420, 341, 504, 34 of IPC and section 3(1)(s) of SC/ST Act. The petitioner is named in the FIR. From perusal of the entire case diary, informant and witnesses have supported the prosecution story mentioned in para-04, 08 and 09 of the case diary respectively.

Considering the above mentioned facts and circumstances, nature of allegation, seriousness and gravity of the offence and in view of section 18 of SC/ST Act, this anticipatory bail is dismissed as not maintainable.

Accordingly, the anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner is hereby **rejected**.

{ Dictated & Corrected by me }

Sd/-
Additional Sessions Judge-1st
Bhojpur at Ara
13.03.2026

Memo No. **Dated:-**
Copy forwarded to the court of.....
for information and needful.

Additional Sessions Judge-Ist,
Bhojpur at Ara.