

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25617 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-678 Year-2021 Thana- NATHNAGAR District- Bhagalpur

MANISH KUMAR @ SONU KUMAR S/o Manoj Kumar Lal R/o Mohalla-  
Tanti Bazar, P.S.- Nathnagar, District- Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Praveen Kumar, Adv  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar No.1, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      31-08-2022      Heard the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to remove the defects within four weeks of resumption of normal court proceedings. In the eventuality of non-removal of defects within stipulated period, office will place the matter before the Bench.

The petitioner apprehend his arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under sections 380 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegedly, the informant gave the responsibility to the petitioner to take care of his house and shop. It is further alleged that when the informant came back to his house, the found that ornaments and money was missing from his house. The informant was told that in absence of the informant, the petitioner was seen coming out of his room and petitioner was not coming on work.



It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case due to suspicion. No such occurrence, in the manner as alleged, has ever taken place. The allegation leveled against the petitioner is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. There is no specific overt act against the petitioner. Though the petitioner is named in the F.I.R., but there is no eye witness in the present case. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent, which is also mentioned in para-3 of the bail application.

Learned APP for the State opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that from the impugned order is clear that the case diary has ample evidence against the petitioner in it.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, since there is ample evidence against the petitioner in the case diary, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail on his behalf is hereby rejected.

This application is accordingly, dismissed.

**(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)**

shikha/-

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

