

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7295 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-319 Year-2024 Thana- HUSSAINGANJ District- Siwan

Raju Kumar Son of Late Madan Sah Resident of Mahual Bazar, P.S. -
Hussainganj, District - Siwan

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Satyendra Rai

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Md. Matloob Rab

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 Hussainganj Police Station Case No. 319 of 2024, dated 14.09.2024, disclosing offences punishable under Sections 324(4)/305/331(4)/329(4)/352 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
3. The prosecution case, as per the First Information Report, is that in the night of 14.09.2024, the petitioner, after damaging the CCTV installed at the electric pole, entered into the house of the informant and committed theft of ornaments worth Rs. 3,00,000/- and Rs. 1,50,000/- in cash.
4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case merely on the basis of suspicion. He further submits that both the parties are agnates and there is land dispute between them. He further submits that there is nothing on record to connect him with the present offence.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that there is direct allegation against the petitioner for committing theft in the house of the informant. Referring to the case diary, he submits that the informant identified him by going through the CCTV footage and the police stored the data of the CCTV footage in a pen drive and when shown to other witnesses, the witnesses identified the person who damaged the CCTV as the petitioner.
6. Regards being had to the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the fact that during investigation, the petitioner was identified by the witnesses as the person who damaged the CCTV installed in front of the house of the informant on an electric pole, 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	√
---	---	---	---

