

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.27086 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-245 Year-2023 Thana- SIWAN MUFFASIL District- Siwan

Sakib @ Md. Sakib Faiyaz @ Sakib Faiyaz S/o Faiyaz Ahmad @ Faiyaz Alam @ Tamanna @ Tamanna Hussain, R/o Vill.- Balatha, Seikh Mohalla, P.S. - Siwan Muffssil/Mahadeva, District- Siwan.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Abhay Kumar Roy, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL DUTTA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

3 08-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Sessions Trial No.91 of 2024 arising out of Siwan Muffasil P.S. Case No.245 of 2023 for the offences registered under Section 395 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this is the third bail petition filed on behalf of the petitioner. Earlier, the prayer for bail of petitioner was twice rejected by this Court vide orders dated 15.01.2024 and 27.09.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No.79083 of 2023 and Cr. Misc. No.57783 of 2024 respectively. He further submits that the looted articles has not been put on T.I.P. to ascertain that the petitioner has committed the alleged offence. Learned counsel submits that not a single witness has named this petitioner in commission of the crime.



Petitioner is in custody since 31.07.2023. He submits that petitioner shall co-operate in the trial.

4. Learned A.P.P. appearing on behalf of the State vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that the regular bail of petitioner was earlier twice rejected on merit vide orders dated 15.01.2024 and 27.09.2024 and no fresh ground is made out for grant of bail to the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner alongwith other co-accused persons were involved in commission of loot in jewellery shop on gun point and the looted jewellery were recovered from his conscious possession, therefore, he does not deserve to be enlarged on regular bail.

5. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case as well as the allegations made against the petitioner and also the facts that earlier the bail petition of the petitioner was twice rejected on merit and there is no fresh ground for entertaining the bail petition of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the bail petition of the petitioner is dismissed.

(Sunil Dutta Mishra, J)

Ritik/-

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

