

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49621 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-88 Year-2024 Thana- SAMSTIPUR RAIL P.S District-
Samastipur

=====

Chunchun Kumar Soni @ Chunchun Kumar Son of Late Ram Ishwar Sah
R/O Vill.- Kalyanpur, P.S.- Bidupur, Dist.- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Brajesh Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Bilash Roy Raman

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 21-08-2024 1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.
2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail,
arises out of GRP/SPJ Police Station Case No. 88 of 2024,
disclosing offences under Section 379 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. As per the prosecution case, on 28.04.2024, at
about 5:30 am, the informant was traveling in Train No.
13508/Gorakhpur Asansol Express and during the course of his
journey, one unknown thief jumped and snatched her purse at
outer signal of Dalsingsarai containing gold ornaments like
mangalsutra, har, kangan, jhumka, rings and Rs. 5,000/-.
4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has not committed any offence in the manner alleged



and has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and no stolen article has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. He next submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated merely on the basis of confessional statement of apprehended co-accused Madan Kumar which has got no evidentiary value. The petitioner has a shop of gold ornaments and he is not connected with the apprehended co-accused in any manner.

5. Having regard to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegation and confessional statement of co-accused Madan Kumar that petitioner used to purchase the stolen gold ornaments and looted article was sold by him in his shop, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. This application is, accordingly, rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

HarshPandey/-

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

