

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78448 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-47 Year-2024 Thana- PALASI District- Araria

Vinod Yadav @ Vinod Kumar Mandal S/o Laddu yadav @ Nageshwar Yadav
@ Nageshwar Mandal Resident of village- Hasanpur (Nirakol) ward no 10,
police station- Palasi, District- Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mukesh Kumar Rana

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Lakshmi Kant Sharma

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 04-12-2024 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 Palasi Police Station Case No. 47 of 2024, dated 10.02.2024, disclosing offences punishable under Sections 413/414 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. The prosecution case, as per the First Information Report lodged by Kanak Lata, S.I. of Police, Palasi Police Station, is that while on patrolling, she got secret information that one stolen motorcycle is being sold from the house of co-accused Manoj Sah, reached at the place of occurrence and on seeing the police, one person tried to flee away, but was apprehended by the police. The



apprehended person disclosed his name as co-accused Manoj Sah. On being demanded, said co-accused Manoj Sah did not produce any document with regard to the motorcycle in question.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure of his name by the arrested co-accused person due to previous enmity. He further submits that the petitioner has no concern with the motorcycle in question and co-accused Manoj Sah has been granted regular bail by the learned Court below.
5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that co-accused Manoj Sah, in his confessional statement, has disclosed that it was the petitioner, who sold him the motorcycle, in question, for Rs. 21,000/- and also gave him the forged document of the motorcycle.
6. Regards being had to the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the name of the petitioner surfaced in this case on the basis of the confessional statement of co-accused as the person who sold him the stolen motorcycle, I am not



inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of anticipatory bail.

7. This application is, accordingly, dismissed

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	✓	T	✓
---	---	---	---

