

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8358 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-707 Year-2023 Thana- FATEHPUR District- Gaya

Vikki Kumar S/O Vijay Yadav R/O Village- Salaiyakhurd, P.S- Fatehpur,
Distt.- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vishwa Ranjan Choudhary

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 3 13-05-2025 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 Fatehpur Police Station Case No. 707 of 2024, dated 25.09.2023, disclosing offences under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.
3. The prosecution case, as per the First Information Report, is that on 25.09.2023, at about 05:00 PM, while the informant was returning to Fatehpur after collecting money of Satin Credit Care Network Ltd. by motorcycle, three unknown persons, who were sitting on a motorcycle, stopped the informant and looted his bag containing Rs. 89,560/-, a Lenovo Tab, Aadhar Card, Votar Card, Pan Card and other documents of the



company on gun point. It has further been alleged that during the occurrence the accused persons fired three bullets from the pistol and then fled away towards Guri Isharve village with looted articles.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the First Information Report and he has falsely been implicated in the present case on the basis of confessional statement made by co-accused Sandeep Kumar from whose house some looted articles have been recovered. He next submits that no incriminating article has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner and/or from the house belonging to him. The petitioner has got no criminal antecedent.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the materials of record, including the impugned order.
6. From perusal of the impugned, it transpires that the co-accused Sandeep Kumar, in his confessional statement, has disclosed the name of the petitioner as his associate. Recovery of looted articles is there from Sandeep Kumar. The confessional statement of Sandeep Kumar coupled



with material collected during course of investigation may be the basis of further investigation against the petitioner.

7. Considering the aforesaid, I do not find any reason to differ with the findings arrived at by learned Additional Sessions Judge V, Gaya, inasmuch as the case is under investigation and custodial interrogation of the petitioner may be necessary, accordingly, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of anticipatory bail.
8. This application is, accordingly, rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

ashwani/-

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

