

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.21665 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-336 Year-2024 Thana- GOH District- Aurangabad

Sonu Kumar @ Atul Kumar S/O Brajesh Sharma @ Tandal Sharma R/O Vill.-
Nagain, P.S- Goh, Dist.- Aurangabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shivendra Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umesh Lal Verma, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 15-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Goh
P.S. Case No. 336 of 2024 instituted for the offences under
Sections 25(1-b)a, 26, 35 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the F.I.R., police, on the basis of a video
posted on social media, raided the house of the petitioner and
apprehended him and, on search, two rifles, one country-made
pistol, four live cartridges and 57 empty cartridges were
recovered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the
petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. No
incriminating article has been recovered from the conscious



possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel further submitted that petitioner has got no concern with the recovered arms and ammunitions. He further submitted that the recovery of the firearms has been made from the joint house of the petitioner where other family members also reside. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 15.11.2024 and has two criminal antecedents. There is no compliance of Section 103 of the Bharatiya Nagarika Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP further submitted that there is a huge recovery of arms and ammunitions from the house of this petitioner as also the petitioner has three antecedents of similar nature as per paragraph no. 17 of the case diary. Leaned APP, therefore, submits that the petitioner does not deserve to be released on bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as also there being the recovery of huge quantity of arms and ammunitions from the house of this petitioner coupled with the fact that petitioner has three criminal antecedents of similar nature, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the



petitioner at this stage.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

8. Learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.

9. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew the prayer for grant of bail before the Trial Court if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from today. If any such application is filed before the learned court below, the court concerned shall consider the same on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

