

**IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-5  
EAST CHAMPARAN, MOTIHARI.**

**Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 6024 of 2025**

1. Pintu Ram @ Raj Kumar Ranjan, S/o- Vishwanath Ram, resident of Village-  
Raghunathpur Bhalua Ward No. 27, P.S.- Raghunathpur, District- East  
Champaran. ....**Petitioner/s**

**Versus**

The State of Bihar ... ..**Opp. Party/s**

**Appearance :**

For the petitioner/s : Dr. Adhir Kumar, Id. Advocate.

For the Opp. Party/s : Sri Subhash Chandra Pd. Yadav, Ld. Addl.P.P.

---

**ORDER**

- 12-03-2026** 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Addl. P.P. appearing on behalf of the prosecution.
2. The petitioner above named seeks pre-arrest bail who apprehends his arrest in connection with Raghunathpur P.S. Case No. 304 of 2025 registered under Sections 308(3), 308(4), 329(3), 111 of B.N.S.
3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 14/10/2025, the work of filling soil was going on his land, suddenly Pintu Ram (petitioner), Sundarlal Ram, Sunny Paswan, and 5-6 unknown people arrived and they threatened him to stop the work. All of them were informed that work on this land would be done only if they get Rs. 50,00,000/-.
4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioners that no other regular or anticipatory bail petition has ever been filed in this matter either before this Court or before the Hon'ble Court. Petitioner has two criminal antecedent i.e. Turkauliya P.S. Case No. 174 of 2022 u/s 147, 148, 341, 323, 327, 384, 386, 120-B IPC & 27 Arms Act and Raghunathpur P.S. Case No. 38 of 2025 u/s 126(2), 115(2), 352, 351(2), 3(5), 303(2), 308(3) of B.N.S. in which he is on bail. He is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged and has falsely been implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. Alleged sections are not being attracted against the petitioner and there is no any specific allegations against the petitioner. Petitioner is ready to abide by provisions of Section 482 (2) of the B.N.S.S.
5. On the other hand, Id. Addl.P.P. opposed the prayer of bail of the petitioner.
6. Perused the case record. From perusal of F.I.R. and case diary, it appears that petitioner is named in the F.I.R and there is allegation against them that in prosecution

of common object accused petitioner alongwith other accused person have threatened to the informant as well as demanding extortion of Rs. 50,00,000/- for filling soil over the land in question. Re-statement of informant in para 2 and witnesses at para no. 7, 8 of the case diary have supported the case of prosecution. In para 29 of the case diary petitioner has one criminal antecedent as mentioned in para 3 of his bail petition. Moreover, investigation is still going on against accused petitioner and others.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case as above, keeping in view the nature of allegation, gravity of offence and materials available in the case diary, I am not inclined to enlarge the accused-petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of accused-petitioner 1. Pintu Ram @ Raj Kumar Ranjan stands rejected.

Let the copy of this order be sent to the learned court below.

(Dictated)

Sd/-

(Rakesh Kumar Tiwari)  
District & Addl. Sessions Judge- 05,  
Motihari, East Champaran  
12-03-2026.