

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.21888 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-453 Year-2024 Thana- RANIYATALAB District- Patna

Sanni Kumar S/O Jitendra Yadav R/O Village- Budhu Chhapra, P.S-
Ranitalab, Distt.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Satyendra Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 23-04-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Ranitalab P.S. Case No, 453 of 2024 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 310(2) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. As per prosecution case, when informant was
returning from a marriage ceremony on his Tiago car alongwith
his companions, 5-6 unknown miscreants on two motorcycles
stopped his car near the village Jitan Chhapra and looted away
mobile phone and cash. Hence, F.I.R. was lodged against
unknown.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence as
alleged in the first information report. He has been falsely



implicated in this case. Learned counsel submits that petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. and his has been surfaced during course of investigation on the basis of C.D.R. report which indicates that petitioner is found at the place of occurrence. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner's house is situated near the place of occurrence and being a local person his location can be very well found near the place of occurrence. No mobile, cash or any other looted article has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Petitioner has not been put on T.I.P. Learned counsel submits that except suspicion there is nothing on the record to connect the present petitioner with the alleged occurrence. Petitioner is in custody since 18.12.2024. Petitioner has criminal antecedent of two cases. Learned counsel orally submits that petitioner is on bail in both the cases. Charge-sheet has already been submitted and there is no likelihood of tampering with the prosecution evidence.

5. The learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, period of custody, charge sheet has been submitted in the case and there is no likelihood of tampering with the



prosecution evidence, argument advanced on behalf of both sides and considering the material available on the record, let the petitioner above named be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Danapur in connection with Ranitalab P.S. Case No. 453 of 2024, subject to following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors shall be either father or mother or sister or brother or wife or the person who has sworn the affidavit in bail application.

(ii) Petitioner will co-operate in trial and will remain present on all dates and absence for two consecutive dates without appropriate permission, would be a ground for cancellation of bail by the learned Trial court itself.

(iii) If the petitioner tamper with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

mcverma/-

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

