

In the Court of **Puneet Kumar Garg**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra  
**Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 561 of 2026 (Revilganj P.S. Case No. 57/2026)**

Vinod Ray & Ors. V/s State of Bihar

**ORDER**

S.No.	Date	Contents	Remarks
01	26.03.2026	<p>1. Heard learned counsel representing the petitioners-accused as well as learned Public Prosecutor for the State on anticipatory bail petition of petitioners-accused, namely, <i>i. Vinod Ray</i>, <i>ii. Saroj Ray @ Saroja Ray</i>, <i>iii. Satendra Ray</i> and <i>iv. Ramesh Ray @ Ramesh Kumar Ray</i>, apprehending their arrest in this Revilganj P.S. Case No. 57/2026, registered under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109(1), 303(2) &amp; 352 r/w 3(5) of BNS, pending in the Court of <i>Shri Kumar Shashi</i>, learned JMFC, Saran at Chapra.</p> <p>2. FIR of this case has been registered on the basis of <i>fardbayan</i> of informant, namely, <i>Niraj Kumar Ray</i>, stating that on 23.01.2026 at about 09:30 P.M., he was present near a banyan tree at <i>Pachpatra Bazaar</i> under <i>Rivilganj Police Station</i>. At that time, due to political enmity, the petitioners-accused along with other accused persons, surrounded the informant and began assaulting him. It is alleged that the petitioner-accused <i>Vinod Ray</i> forcibly pulled the informant out of his vehicle by catching his neck and threatened to kill him. Thereafter, accused the petitioner-accused, <i>Saroj Ray @ Dholan Ray</i> assaulted the informant with a sword, striking his head and causing a cut injury, due to which blood started oozing out. Subsequently, the petitioner-accused, <i>Satendra Ray</i> inflicted a knife blow on the informant, causing injury on the right side of his back. When the informant's brother <i>Dhuman Kumar</i> and his nephew <i>Sonu Kumar</i> rushed to rescue him, the accused persons assaulted them with clubs and sticks. As a result, <i>Dhuman Kumar</i> sustained injuries on his right hand and <i>Sonu Kumar</i> sustained injuries on his left hand. It is further alleged that during the course of the assault, a gold chain was snatched from the neck of <i>Dharmendra Ray</i>. Upon hearing the cries for help, local people gathered at the spot, after which the accused persons fled away.</p> <p>3. It is asserted on behalf of learned counsel representing the petitioners-accused that they are quite innocent, have not committed any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. and have falsely been implicated in this false case due to political vendetta. Next added that no any regular or anticipatory bail petition has been filed or moved on behalf of the petitioners-accused prior to this either in this Court or Hon'ble High Court Patna, in connection with the present case. Next contended that the petitioner-accused nos.(i) &amp; (iii) have got one criminal antecedent <i>vide</i> Revilganj P.S. Case No. 65/2011, the petitioner-accused no.(ii) got two criminal antecedents <i>vide</i> Revilganj P.S. Case No. 65/2011 and Manjhi P.S. Case No. 135/2024 and the petitioner-accused no.</p>	

In the Court of **Puneet Kumar Garg**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra  
**Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 561 of 2026 (Revilganj P.S. Case No. 57/2026)**

Vinod Ray & Ors. V/s State of Bihar

**ORDER**

	<p>(iv) got clean antecedent except this one. Further contended that the allegation of theft is omnibus and there is no any specific allegation against any of the petitioners-accused. Next contended that all sections areailable in nature except sections 109(1) and 303(2) of the BNS, which are super addition to make the case graver in nature. Further submitted that the petitioners-accused are ready to furnish sureties as required by the Court. Therefore, it is prayed that the petitioners-accused may be enlarged on anticipatory bail.</p> <p>4. Learned Public Prosecutor opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners-accused.</p> <p>5. Heard both the sides and perused the relevant materials available on record. From the perusal of the case diary para nos. 35, 36 &amp; 37, it is found that there are several injuries reported, and the injuries have been sustained on vital part of the body of the injured. Furthermore, para no. 03 of the bail petition discloses the alleged criminal antecedents of the petitioners-accused. However, the informant has subsequently filed an affidavit bringing on record additional alleged criminal antecedents of the petitioners-accused, which were not mentioned earlier in the bail petition. Moreover, the investigation is still pending, this Court is of the view that there exists a real possibility of the accused influencing the victim and tampering with the evidence. .</p> <p>6. Hence, considering the seriousness of the offence, the requirement of proper investigation, and the reasons mentioned herein-above, the petitioners-accused are not entitled to get anticipatory bail. Accordingly, prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners-accused, namely, <i>i. Vinod Ray, ii. Saroj Ray @ Saroja Ray, iii. Satendra Ray and iv. Ramesh Ray @ Ramesh Kumar Ray</i>, is hereby <b>rejected</b>.</p> <p>[Dictated]</p> <p><b>(Puneet Kumar Garg),</b> Sessions Judg, Saran 26.03.2026</p>	