

In the Court of **Puneet Kumar Garg**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra
Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 860 of 2026 (Bhagwan Bazar P.S. Case No. 214/2025)
Nanhe Ray @ Indrajeet Ray V/s State of Bihar

ORDER

S.No.	Date	Contents	Remarks
01	17.04.2026	<p>1. Heard learned counsel representing the petitioner-accused as well as learned Public Prosecutor representing the State on anticipatory bail petition of petitioner-accused, namely, Nanhe Ray @ Indrajeet Ray, apprehending his arrest in this Bhagwan Bazar P.S. Case No. 214/2025, registered under Sections 106, 115(2), 126(2), 200, 318(4), 352, 351(2) & 351(3) r/w 3(5) of the BNS, pending in the Court of learned ACJM- 2nd, Saran at Chapra.</p> <p>2. FIR of this case has been registered on the basis of <i>fardebayan</i> of the informant, namely, <i>Ashok Manjhi</i>, stating that on 24.04.2025 at about 08:15 hours, his uncle became injured by falling from a palm tree, he was taken to PHC, from where he was referred to <i>Sadar hospital, Chapra</i>. The informant arranged a private ambulance and took the injured to a private clinic of <i>Dr. Santosh Kumar</i>. The doctor allegedly demanded Rs. 1,50,000/- for surgery and insisted on an advance payment. Despite repeated requests by the informant, who expressed inability to pay immediately, treatment was not properly initiated and further money was demanded after conducting X-ray. It is alleged that the injured was kept waiting and was not given timely medical treatment. Later, the doctor refused to treat him and asked to take him to <i>Sadar Hospital</i>. Thereafter, the injured was again taken to <i>Sadar Hospital, Chapra</i>, where due to delay in treatment and alleged negligence, he was declared dead after about an hour. The informant alleged that due to continuous shifting of the patient and delay in proper treatment, his uncle died. On raising protest, co-accused persons arrived and started abusing and assaulting, causing the informant and ambulance driver to flee from the place.</p> <p>3. It is contended on behalf of learned counsel representing the petitioner-accused that he is quite innocent and has not committed any offence as alleged in F.I.R. Next contended that earlier one ABP No. 142/2026 filed on behalf of the petitioner-accused was dismissed for withdrawn by this Court <i>vide</i> order dated 12.01.2026 and except that, no ABP or regular bail has been filed on behalf of the petitioner-accused in this Court or Hon'ble High Court, Patna in connection with the present case. Next added that the petitioner-accused has got clean antecedent, except this one. Next added that all the allegations levelled against the petitioner-accused are totally false, concocted and frivolous. Next contended that on the direction of the informant, this petitioner-accused was present at <i>Sadar Hospital, Chapra</i> and he helped him whatever was possible to him. Next stated that the co-accused <i>Dr. Santosh Kumar</i> has already been enlarged on anticipatory bail by this Court <i>vide</i> order dated 03.12.2025 passed in ABP No. 3854/2025, and the case of this petitioner-accused stands on better footing. Next asserted that no wrongful gain has been obtained to this petitioner-accused. Further submitted that the petitioner-accused is ready to furnish sureties as</p>	

In the Court of **Puneet Kumar Garg**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra
Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 860 of 2026 (Bhagwan Bazar P.S. Case No. 214/2025)
Nanhe Ray @ Indrajeet Ray V/s State of Bihar

ORDER

	<p>required by the Court. Therefore, it is prayed that the petitioner-accused may be enlarged on anticipatory bail.</p> <p>4. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor representing the State vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner-accused.</p> <p>5. Heard both the sides and perused the materials available on record. From the same, it appears that the role of the petitioner-accused is limited to assisting in arranging and accompanying the injured to the hospital and calling the ambulance. There is no specific allegation that he demanded money, assaulted the informant, or was involved in any act directly causing the death of the deceased. The petitioner-accused does not appear to have any direct or overt act connecting him with the alleged offence. Furthermore, the co-accused of this case has already been enlarged on anticipatory bail by this Court <i>vide</i> order dated 03.12.2025 passed in ABP No. 3854/2025.</p> <p>6. So, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of accusation, absence of specific allegation and criminal antecedent, the earlier grounds taken in ABP order enlarging the co-accused of this case on anticipatory bail, and the reasons mentioned herein-above, this Anticipatory Bail Petition, bearing No. 860 of 2026, is hereby allowed. In the event of his arrest or surrender within one month from this order, the petitioner-accused, namely, Nanhe Ray @ Indrajeet Ray, be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- <u>with two sureties</u> of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court concerned subject to the conditions as laid down u/s 482(2) of B.N.S.S., 2023 :-</p> <p>(I) That the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by I.O., as and when required,</p> <p>(II) That the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to the I.O. of the case,</p> <p>(III) That the petitioner shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court,</p> <p>(IV) That the petitioner is directed to co-operate in trial and disposal of the case.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[Dictated]</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Puneet Kumar Garg), Sessions Judge, Saran 17.04.2026</p>	