

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12727 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-43 Year-2024 Thana- TELMAR District- Nalanda

Saurabh Kumar @ Sorabh Kumar S/O Rampravesh Yadav @ Rampravesh Singh R/O Village- Baruna, P.S- Fatuha, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jay Ram Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Singh No. 1, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

3 14-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Telmar P.S. Case No. 43 of 2024, instituted for the offences punishable under Section 394 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, some unknown miscreants allegedly robbed informant's brother-in-law of Rs. 1 lakh at gun point, fired upon the informant due to which he sustained injury and in the meantime, the miscreants fled away from the spot.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. No



incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. Name of the petitioner has transpired in this case on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused, namely, Azad Kumar and the same has got no evidentiary value. It is further submitted that neither any looted cash has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner nor any T.I. parade has been conducted in this case. The petitioner is in custody since 03.08.2024 and has got seven criminal antecedents.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that specific allegation of firing is against the petitioner. Co-accused, namely, Azad Kumar has confessed that the petitioner was involved in the alleged crime and has fired upon the informant. It is further submitted that the petitioner has got seven criminal antecedents of same nature. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, criminal antecedents, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.



7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial and conclude the same expeditiously.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

