

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9314 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-336 Year-2022 Thana- MASAUDHI District- Patna

Imam @ Md. Inam S/O Md. Chandu R/O Village- Taregna Dih, P.S-
Masaurhi, Distt.- Patna. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dharendra Kumar Sinha, Advocate Mr. Amrit Lal, Advocate Ms. Soni Kumari, Advocate Mr. Rahul Rathour, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

8 10-10-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sessions Trial No. 1160 of 2023 (arising out of Masaurhi P.S. Case No. 336 of 2022) in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 147, 149, 341, 323, 307, 504, 506 and 302 of the IPC.

3. According to the FIR, the informant along with his cousins were sitting in a cyber cafe. Meanwhile, 8-10 miscreants came there carrying iron rod etc. and started assaulting one of the cousin of the informant, namely, Ankit Kumar due to which he suffered head injuries. The informant stated that the occurrence was captured in a CCTV Camera installed in the market. The informant has mentioned in the FIR



that if the CCTV footage of that camera is procured, the accused persons may be seen in that CCTV footage.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. Other co-accused persons namely, Rahul Kumar Paswan @ Gulam and Saurabh Kumar have been granted regular bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court but the prayer for bail of this petitioner has been rejected on the ground that he was seen in CCTV footage. He submitted further that the investigating authorities claims in Paragraph 28 of the case diary that the petitioner was identified by some persons in the CCTV footage but the investigating authorities did not disclose the name of the persons by whom the petitioner was identified. He has further submitted that the CCTV footage was not seized by the investigating officer. In this regard, a report was called for from the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patna vide order dated 18.07.2025. The report has been received in which it has been mentioned by the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patna that due to negligence of the investigating officer, the CCTV footage was not seized/ procured. As per the report of the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patna, the investigating officer was not trained for investigation of the cases and a direction was



given for his compulsory training. It has further been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has remained in custody since 16.06.2022 and only one witness has been examined till date who didn't support the prosecution case.

5. Learned APP has opposed the prayer for bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, let the petitioner named above, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional Sessions Judge-1st, Masaurhi at Patna in connection with Sessions Trial No. 1160 of 2023 (arising out of Masaurhi P.S. Case No. 336 of 2022) with condition that the petitioner shall cooperated with the trial of the case and make himself available as and when required by the court.

7. The petitioner shall physically appear before the learned Court below on each and every date till conclusion of the trial. In case of failure on two consecutive dates, unless he is prevented by extremely adverse circumstances, the learned Court below will be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

8. Before accepting the bail bond, the criminal antecedent of the petitioner shall be verified from all the



police stations of the District and if, it is found that he is involved in any other case except the case(s), mentioned in paragraph no. 3 of the bail petition, his bail bond shall not be accepted.

9. One of the bailors must be close relatives of the petitioner such as mother, father, brother, sister or wife.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

priyanka/-

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

