

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17551 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-29 Year-2024 Thana- BIHARSHARIF RAIL P.S. District- Patna

Chintu Kumar Son of Lali Kewat Resident of Mohalla - Gulzarbagh, Neem
Ke Bhati, P.S.- Alamganj, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 18695 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-29 Year-2024 Thana- BIHARSHARIF RAIL P.S. District- Patna

1. Anand Kumar @ Anand Kumar Bhagat S/o- Jay Narayan Bhagat Village-
Chhoti Maraiya Ps- Nagar Vaishali Dist- Vaishali
2. Pramod Kumar S/o- Late Rameshwar Prasad Village- Tulsi Mandi
Gulzarbag Ps- Alamganj Dist- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 17551 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pranaya Shankar Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. J.N. Thakur, APP

For the informant : Mrs. Shilpi Singh, Adv.

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 18695 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bhim Kumar Yadav

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. J.N. Thakur, APP

For the informant : Mrs. Shilpi Singh, Adv.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

3 13-05-2025 Both the cases arise out of the same case i.e. Biharsharif
Rail P.S. Case No. 29 of 2024 and accordingly, the same are being
heard together and disposed of by this common order.

2. Heard learned counsels for the petitioners and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

3. The petitioners seek bail in a case registered for the



offence punishable under Section-305 of B.N.S.

4. Allegedly, in course of journey from Danapur to Bihar Sharif, the trolly bag of the informant containing different ornaments worth Rs. 16,00,000/- (sixteen lakhs) was stolen away by unknown miscreants.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have falsely been implicated in this case. The FIR is against unknown. There is no specific allegation against the petitioners. The petitioners are in custody since 02-01-2025.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the State has opposed the prayer for bail submitting that the petitioners have got criminal antecedent.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, specially the criminal antecedent, presently, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail and accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioners is rejected.

7. However, if so advised, the petitioners may renew their prayer for bail after completion of six months in custody before the court below itself.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

A.K.V.//-

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

