

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42162 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-286 Year-2023 Thana- RAJAON District- Banka

Sudhanshu Kumar @ Sudhanshu Anand Son Of Sanjay Kumar Village-
Sakahra P.S.- Rajoun, Distt.- Banka

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sunil Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr.Shyameshwar Dayal, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 19-07-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. This is the second attempt for bail of the petitioner
as earlier such prayer was rejected by order dated 19.10.2023 in
Cr. Misc. No. 68473 of 2023.

3. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Rajoun
(Nawada) P.S. Case No. 286 of 2023 registered for the offence
punishable under Sections 392/411 of the Indian Penal Code.

4. The following order was passed on 19.10.2023 in
Cr. Misc. No. 68473 of 2023 which reads as under:

*“ Heard learned counsel appearing on
behalf of the petitioner and learned APP
appearing on behalf of the State.*

*2. Let the defect(s), if any, be removed
within a period of four weeks from today.*

*3. The petitioner seeks bail in
connection with Rajoun (Nawada) P.S. Case No.*



286 of 2023 registered for the offence under Sections 392 and 411 of the Indian Penal Code.

4. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner along with other criminals have committed a loot of mobile phone, laptop etc. from the informant.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case.

6. Learned APP for the State opposed the prayer of bail of the petitioner by contending that the petitioner has been named in the FIR and mobile phone and laptop has been recovered from his possession. He further submits that the petitioner has criminal antecedents also.

7. In view of the facts and circumstances, as mentioned above, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the prayer of bail of the petitioner is rejected herewith.

9. The Court below is directed to expedite the trial of the petitioner.”

5. This Court finds no new ground to review its earlier order dated 19.10.2023.

6. Accordingly, this application stands dismissed again.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

U		T	
---	--	---	--

