

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31034 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-31 Year-2019 Thana- SAMASTIPUR MUFFASIL District-
Samastipur

=====

Md. Sajmat @ Md. Saddam @ Md. Sadam S/o Md. Moim Resident of
Village- Harpur Rewari, P.S.- Angarghat, District- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Brajesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Raj Kishor Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 20-05-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Samastipur (M) P.S. Case No. 31 of 2019 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 379 and 411 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Allegedly a stolen motorcycle has been recovered from the house of the petitioner.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner contended that admittedly the petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. and his name has been surfaced on the confessional statement of co-accused Akhilesh Singh, which has got no evidentiary value. So far the alleged recovery from the house of the petitioner is concerned, the same has been refuted by the petitioner and the public



representative; inasmuch, as a certificate has been issued by the Mukhiya of the Gram Panchayat Raj, Harpur Rewari, who has disclosed that the petitioner is a person of having good character and used to work as a labourer in Lucknow. Since the petitioner has been working outside the State, he was not knowing the fact of institution of the present F.I.R., therefore, the present application has been filed before this Court.

5. On the other hand, learned APP for the State opposes the bail application and submits that apart from one criminal antecedent, the petitioner has been evading from the law for the last six years.

6. Regard being had to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and considering the fact that the alleged recovery has been made from the house of the petitioner, coupled with his criminal antecedent and he has been evading from arrest, this Court is not acceded to the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the present application stands rejected.

(Harish Kumar, J)

uday/-

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

