

---

**In the Court of Sessions Judge, East Champaran at Motihari.**

Present:-

Abhishek K. Das  
Sessions Judge,  
East Champaran at Motihari

**Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 570 of 2026**

1. **Ankit Raj, aged about 27 years, S/o- Sanjay Kumar Bhanu.**  
R/o Mohalla- Agarwa, Ward No.35, P.S. Motihari Town, District- East Champaran.  
-----Petitioner.  
**Versus**  
**The State of Bihar** -----Opposite party.

Counsel for the Petitioner :- Sri Arun Prakash Upadhyay, Advocate.  
Counsel for the State :- Sri Khublal Prasad, Public Prosecutor.

**10.03.2026**

This is an anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of petitioner, namely, Ankit Raj, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Motihari Town P.S. Case No. 209 of 2025 for the offences U/S 316(2), 318(4), 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

**In para-2 of the anticipatory bail petition, it is mentioned that no other anticipatory or regular bail petition has been filed earlier on behalf of the petitioner either in this Court or before the Hon'ble Patna High Court. As per para-3 of the anticipatory bail petition, the petitioner has criminal antecedents of (1) Tr. No. 3569/2025, (2) Tr. No. 3626/2025, (3) Tr. No. 3587/2025, (4) Tr. No. 3700/2025 and (5) Town P.S. Case No. 05/2026.**

The prosecution's case, in brief, as per typed application of the informant Pradeep Kumar, is that he runs a medicine shop and is also a stockist of medicines. His known medicine dealers, namely, Ankit Raj @ Sonu (petitioner) and Sanjay Kumar Bhanu, proprietor of Ayush Drug International, demanded rupees 20 Lacs from him as advance for making stockist of Micro Lab medicine company. On the said demand, the informant had deposited Rs. 15,11,859/- through RTGS in the HDFC account of Ayush Drug International on different dates and had given remaining amount of Rs. 4,88,141/- in cash on 30.06.2024. After taking the said money as per conditions, they were neither getting the stockist of the Micro Lab company nor returning the money of informant. Both these persons have cheated him and committed breach of trust. It is further alleged that on 01.03.2025 when the informant went at their house and demanded his money, they stated to talk him at his shop. At about 7:00 PM Sanjay Kumar Bhanu came at informant's shop

alongwith other co-accused persons and started abusing him and threatened to kill him, if the money will be demanded again and have also stated that they shall not return his money.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has committed no offence. The petitioner is proprietor of Ayush Drug International and the informant has paid amount in the account of Ayush Drug International and the amount has been returned. The petitioner has nothing to do with the alleged occurrence. The allegation against the petitioner is general, vague and omnibus and the alleged sections are not being made out against him. On these basis, it is prayed to allow the anticipatory bail petition.

The learned Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the State opposed the anticipatory bail on the basis of materials available in the case diary.

Heard both sides and perused the record. As per F.I.R., the petitioner is named in the F.I.R. with the allegation that the petitioner alongwith another Sanjay Kumar Bhanu took money Rs. 20,00,000/- from the informant for making stockist of Micro Lab medicine company, but they neither get the stockist of the Micro Lab company nor return the money of informant and when the informant make demand of his money, the petitioner and others named persons in the F.I.R. abused him and refused to return his money also. As per para-2, 6, 7 of the case diary, the informant in his restatement and the witnesses have corroborated the version of F.I.R. In para-19 of the case diary, statements of account of informant and statements of account of HDFC bank in which the informant had deposited the money is mentioned, which also corroborated the version of F.I.R. As per para-3 of anticipatory bail petition, the petitioner has five criminal antecedents. As per para-22 of the case diary, the petitioner has one criminal antecedent. As per para-23 of the case diary, investigation is under progress.

In the facts of the case as discussed above and keeping in view the nature of allegation, materials available in the case diary and five criminal antecedents of the petitioner, I am not inclined to give privilege of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of petitioner, namely, **Ankit Raj** stands **rejected**.

(Dictated)

Sd/-

Sessions Judge  
East Champaran at Motihari  
10.03.2026