

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14541 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-785 Year-2024 Thana- PHULWARISHARIF District- Patna

Sanoj Kumar Son of Late Ravindra Singh @ Ravindra Ray Resident of
Village- Chitnawa, PS- Maner, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nagendra Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Akshay Lal Pandit, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 28-02-2025 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 Phulwarisharif Police Station Case No. 785 of
2024, disclosing offences under Sections 406, 420, 120B, 302,
34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, on 04.06.2024 in the
evening while the son of the informant namely Vikash Kumar
was at home, he received a call on mobile. One Sanoj Kumar
had called him for negotiation of land for which the informant's
son had paid a sum of Rs. 10 Lakh to the cousin of Sanoj Kumar
namely Suraj Kumar. At 8:20 P.M. when the wife of Vikash
Kumar called on his mobile, he told that he was with Sanoj
Kumar, Abhishek Kumar and his friends. Again at 9:00 P.M.
when his wife called, his mobile was switched off. On search, at
about 3:00 A.M. in the intervening night of 04.06.2024 the
Police was informed and at 5:00 A.M. information was received



that Vikash Kumar has been murdered and his dead body was found in Dibra Chamber and at some distance Apachi motorcycle of Vikash Kumar was standing.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not committed any offence in the manner alleged. The allegation against the petitioner is general and omnibus in nature. Petitioner has been made accused on the basis of suspicion. There is nothing that connects that petitioner with the alleged offence. There is no eye witness to the occurrence.

5. Having regard to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the gravity of offence the fact that the petitioner is named in the FIR, being the main conspirator, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. This application is, accordingly, rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

HarshPandey/-

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

