

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.77327 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-45 Year-2024 Thana- KRITYANAND NAGAR District- Purnia

1. Sujit Ram @ Sujit Kumar Ram S/O Sita Ram R/O Village- Sahbajja, Jhunikala, P.S- K. Nagar, Distt.- Purnea
2. Abhinandan Ram A @ Abhinandan Kumar S/O Dinesh Ram R/O Village- Roska, Koska Dih, P.S- K. Nagar, Distt.- Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vikram Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Humayou Ahmad Khan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 21-11-2024 1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioners and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.
2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail, arises out of K. Nagar Police Station Case No. 45 of 2024, dated 25.01.2024, disclosing offences punishable under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. The prosecution case, as per the First Information Report, is that at about 7 PM on 22.01.2024, while the informant was returning, three unknown miscreants overtook him and snatched a sum of Rs. 9,262/- and one mobile phone.
4. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated



in this case with ulterior motive. He further submits that the petitioners are not named in the First Information Report and their names transpired in this case on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused Pintu Kumar. He further submits that the petitioner has got no criminal antecedent.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that the confessional statement of co-accused Pintu Kumar led to the recovery of the mobile phone of the informant and co-accused Pintu Kumar, in his confessional statement, has not only confessed his guilt, but also disclosed the active participation of the petitioners in the alleged crime.
6. I have heard learned Counsel for the parties concerned and have perused the material available on record, including the impugned order.
7. From perusal of the impugned order, it transpires that the co-accused Pintu Kumar, in his confessional statement, has disclosed the active involvement of the petitioners in the alleged offence.
8. Considering the above, I do not find any reason to differ



with the findings arrived at by the learned Sessions Judge, Purnea, inasmuch as the case is under investigation, wherein the custodial interrogation of the petitioners may be necessary based upon the material collected by the police during course of investigation. As such, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

9. This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	✓	T	✓
---	---	---	---

