IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.55330 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-48 Year-2026 Thana- DARBHANGA SADAR District- Darbhanga

==========

Md. Arwaz Ansari @ Arbaz Ansari Son of Md. Kalim Ansari Resident of Village- Saramohanpur, Ward No. -08, P.S.- Sadar, District- Darbhanga.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Virendra Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

2 20-08-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Sadar P.S. Case No. 48 of 2026 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 190, 126(2), 127(2), 316(2), 308(2), 318(4), 351(2), 352 and 303(2) of the BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the informant alleges that he transferred an amount of Rs. 25,000/- in the account of the petitioner from the account of his brother and thereafter again transferred an amount of Rs. 10,000/- in petitioner's mobile no. 8207726204 and another Rs. 10,000/- was transferred in the petitioner's account online from account of his

WEB COPY

brother, as such an amount of Rs. 45,000/- was transferred to petitioner in lieu of purchasing a motorcycle, but the petitioner did not give the owner book of the motorcycle, hence informant got suspicious and requested the petitioner to return the amount and also returned the motorcycle, but petitioner avoided to return the amount and called the informant who went along with his cousin, Rashid to meet the petitioner when petitioner took them to a Mango orchard where 10-12 unknown accused surrounded them and snatched the mobile of Rashid along with other articles including Rs. 15,000/- and confined them for three hours and recorded their video compelling them to say false things and demanded Rs. 2 Lakhs for deleting the video, thereafter they were released and they came back to the house of their brother-in-law, Md. Irfan Ansari and disclosed about the occurrence, further on 17.01.2026, the informant and his family members were called by family members of Arbaz (petitioner), further Kalim returned the mobile after formatting it, and the amount of Rs. 45,000/- along with other articles were also returned, it is next alleged that on 18.01.2026, Rashid activated his SIM when he came to know that Crypto of 5000 $ was transferred and converted into cash by MEX C Exchange of value Rs. 4,50,000/-, accordingly, informant asked the petitioner

WEB COPY

about the said transaction, on which petitioner refused of having any knowledge about the same.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that petitioner returned Rs. 45,000/- along with other articles as detailed in the FIR, which the informant alleges initially was taken by the petitioner. It is also submitted that even mobile of Rashid was returned by Kalim. It is also submitted that whether it was Rashid who transferred the Crypto currency into cash or petitioner along with other accused committed the occurrence is an aspect of investigation. It is also submitted that had petitioner or his associates committed such an occurrence, in that event they would not have returned the mobile to Rashid, on which the learned APP submits that the mobile was returned after formatting it. It is also submitted by the learned APP that investigation in the case is continuing and if petitioner is innocent, the police will exonerate him of the allegation, but then petitioner has antecedent of two cases and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence.

WEB COPY

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

U		T	

WEB COPY