

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31203 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-115 Year-2016 Thana- MOKAMAH District- Patna

Pintu Mishra S/o- Rajesh Mishra Vill- Sokhra Kalam Bag, Ward No.11, P.S-
Begusarai, District-Begusarai, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kundan Kumar Ojha, Adv.

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

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

3 31-10-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Mokama P.S Case No. 115 of 2016 dated 01.07.2016 registered for the offence punishable u/s 392 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, two unknown miscreants ridden on a motorcycle came and snatched the bag of the informant containing Rs. 4,80,000/- thereafter the miscreants fled away.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious



possession of the petitioner. The petitioner is not named in the FIR. The name of the petitioner was transpired in this case in the confessional statement of the co-accused, Kundan Tiwari. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged offence. The petitioner has one criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The other co-accused person has already been granted regular bail by this court *vide* order dated 13.03.2023 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 65336/2022.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submitted that the specific allegation of snatching Rs. 4.80 lakhs from the informant is against the petitioner and the co-accused person. The confessional statement of the co-accused, Kundan Tiwari, mentioned in para-37 of the case diary, disclosed the name of the petitioner and the petitioner was involved in the alleged offence.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the gravity of offence against the petitioner. It is not fit case for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected and the petitioner is directed to surrender before the Court below concerned within six weeks from the date of



this order and pray for regular bail, the learned Court below may consider the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner in accordance with law and on its own merits without being prejudiced by this order.

7. This application is rejected

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

shivam/-

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

