

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20280 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-330 Year-2021 Thana- GAURICHAK District- Patna

VIKASH KUMAR @ VIKASH SINGH SON OF VIJAY SINGH R/O-  
NITAICHAK PS-THARTHARI DISTRICT-NALANDA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shyamal Prakash, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jagdhar Prasad, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      01-11-2022                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has antecedent of nine cases and the informant, who is the driver of pickup van and whose owner is Gaurav Kumar, alleges that on 13.08.2021 at 3:30 o'clock while he was crossing a bridge, four unidentified accused driving a Scorpio vehicle dashed his pickup van with their vehicle, it is next alleged that they surrounded the informant and questioned why he hit the vehicle, thereafter two accused at gunpoint made the informant sit in their Scorpio and took the informant's pickup van and fled



away along with mobile of the informant and thereafter left the informant on the road.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, it is next submitted that the FIR was against unknown and the name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of co-accused in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value, it is further submitted that some cartoons are alleged to have been recovered from the house of the petitioner which were being carried in the pickup van. Learned counsel submits that the seizure list does not contain signature of any family member of the petitioner which amply demonstrates that the petitioner on account of his antecedents came to be implicated falsely.

Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that petitioner has antecedent of nine cases out of which two cases are of serious nature, it is next submitted that during the course of investigation it has transpired that some of the cartoons being carried in the pickup van were recovered from the house of the petitioner which directly connects the petitioner with the offence.



Considering the submissions made by the learned  
A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the  
privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. His prayer for  
anticipatory bail is thus rejected.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

Rishi/-

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

