

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11537 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-434 Year-2024 Thana- MOTIHARI TOWN District- East
Champaran

=====

Ankit Kumar S/O Rakesh Singh R/O Village- Mathurapur, P.S- Pipra, Distt-
East Champaran. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Madhuri Lata, APP.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 05-03-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for
the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Motihari
Town P.S. Case No. 434 of 2024 registered for the offences
punishable u/s 309(4) of the B.N.S., 2023 and Section 27 of the
Arms Act.

3. As per prosecution case, three unknown persons are said
to have committed loot of Rs. 8,00,000/- from one Ajay Kumar.
They also opened firing upon him, as a result, he sustained gunshot
injury.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that
petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. No such
occurrence as alleged has ever taken place. No incriminating
article has been recovered from the conscious physical possession
of the petitioner. He has falsely been implicated in this case due to



ulterior motive. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is totally false and based on concocted facts. Nothing specific has been attributed against him. He is not named in the FIR, but during the course of investigation, co-accused Subhash Kumar was arrested and he confessed his own involvement as well as involvement of the petitioner in commission of the alleged occurrence. There is nothing on record to indicate the complicity of the petitioner barring the confessional statement of the apprehended person which has no evidentiary value in the eye of law. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner has one criminal antecedent and he has been languishing in custody since 22.11.2024.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case as well as the nature of the offence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

7. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

8. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

