

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22606 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-50 Year-2024 Thana- CHACKMEHSI District- Samastipur

Manish Kumar @ Baija Son of Krishndev Sahni Resident of Village -
Maheshpur, Police Station - Muzaffarpur, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amit Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Murli Dhar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 05-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Chakmaheshi P.S. Case No. 50/2024 registered for the offences punishable under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, informant's money of Rs.4,31,935/- was looted by three miscreants. It is alleged that they also looted Rs.235/- alongwith Aadhar card from Nirupam Kumar and Rs.175/- alongwith Aadhar card from Vidyanand Kumar who were working at the Petrol pump and they fled away from the place of occurrence. FIR lodged against unknown.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence as alleged in the FIR and he has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner bears criminal antecedent of one case of Arms Act. The petitioner is not apprehended on the spot and nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. He further submits that the name of petitioner transpired in this case on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused Guddu Kumar. Except confessional statement of the said co-accused, there is nothing on record to demonstrate the complicity of the present petitioner with the alleged occurrence. There is no direct or indirect evidence against the petitioner.

3. Learned APP for the State opposed the prayer of anticipatory bail of the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner having criminal antecedent for the offences under Sections 399, 402, 419, 414 of the I.P.C and Sections 25(1-B), 26, 35 of the Arms Act and the investigation is going on. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.

4. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, argument advanced on behalf of the both sides, the petitioner bears criminal antecedent of Arms Act, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to petitioner.

5. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the



petitioner stands rejected.

6. However, in case the petitioner surrenders before the concerned court within six weeks from the date of receipt of the order and seeks regular bail, the concerned court may pass an appropriate order on the day of hearing without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

amitkumar/-

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

