

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43142 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-589 Year-2023 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

Ajay Kumar @ Vijay Kumar S/o Lalan Ray Village- Gurdah @ Gaushnagar,
P.s.- Mahindwara, District- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Tribhuwan Narayan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shahabuddin Azeem @ S. Azeem

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER**

3 09-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned APP.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Runnisaidpur P.S. Case No.589/2023, registered for the
offence punishable under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that on 30.11.2023 at 7.12 P.M. he was intercepted by
unknown miscreants, who looted his Hero Splendor motorcycle
along with Oppo mobile and Rs.3600/- and the accused fled.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the
informant based on confessional statement of apprehended
accused in police custody, who were apprehended 90 days after
the occurrence in a different criminal case. It is next submitted
that confessional statement of apprehended accused in police



custody does not have any evidentiary value.

5. Learned APP opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and submits that it is difficult to rebut the submission made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner but then it is submitted that the name of this petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of Vinod from whose possession, the looted motorcycles of the instant case was recovered. It is next submitted that since Vinod has confessed the name of the petitioner that he was involved in the occurrence of loot in the present case and the motorcycles have been recovered from his possession, as such the petitioner should not be enlarged on anticipatory bail. It is also submitted that investigation in the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submission made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

