

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80875 of 2019**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-242 Year-2019 Thana- MUZAFFARPUR SADAR District-  
Muzaffarpur

=====

Manish Kumar [Male, Aged about 27 years], Son of Munna Kumar @ Munna Prasad Resident of Mohalla - Jai Prakash Nagar Koluha, P.S.- Ahiyapur, District - Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar @ S.K.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rabindra Kumar, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      05-01-2021                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
counsel for the State.

In this case, the petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Sadar P.S. Case No. 242 of 2019 registered for offences under sections 400/401/216 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 25(1-b)a/26/35/27(II) of the Arms Act.

In the present case, the police, on receipt of secret information that the accused persons of Mutthu Gold Bank loot case, have come at the house of Ashish Kumar Singh, conducted a raid and arrested two persons, namely, Ashish Kumar Singh and Prabhat Kumar Chaudhary and from them, the police recovered one pistol and 5+5 live cartridges along with a hp laptop and two cheques each of Rs. 1 lakh as also passport of Manish Kumar (the present petitioner) and both the persons



were explained that they were involved in commission of crime of robbery of the Mutthu Gold Bank along with the present petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the seized articles related to the petitioner were not recovered from the alleged place of occurrence rather the same were recovered from the house of the petitioner which were planted only to implicate the present petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner has got no criminal antecedent.

Learned counsel for the State submits that two cheques, each of Rs. 1 lakh signed by the petitioner, have been recovered from the house of the petitioner.

Looking to the nature of allegation made against the petitioner as also considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner, above named, is rejected.

**(Shivaji Pandey, J)**

rishi/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

