

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.41890 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2 Year-2024 Thana- MANER District- Patna

=====

Dhananjay Kumar @ Shankar Kumar @ Shankar son of Bijali Ray village
and Post - Anandpur, P.S - Bihta, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

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

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

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

4 11-12-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in Maner P.S.
Case No. 02 of 2024 registered under Section-392 of the Indian
Penal Code and 27 of the Arms Act.

3. According to allegation, when the informant after
collecting money from the customers, was returning by his
motorcycle, two miscreants intercepted him at the point of arms
and having snatched his bag containing Rs. 13,58,000/-,they
fled away by their blue colour Apache motorcycle. In course of
fleeing away, firing was also made by them. The informant
states that the occurrence would be seen in CCTV camera. The
investigating authorities inspected the video footage of CCTV



camera wherein it was found that the miscreants were snatching a bag from the informant and the third person was found present there pointing pistol at him.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in this case. Except the confessional statement of co-accused, Rahul Kumar, there is nothing against him.

5. On the other hand, Mr. Shailendra Kumar, the learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail by submitting that the bag was recovered and, the informant identified it. The name of the petitioner figured in the confessional statement of co-accused which is leading to recovery of booty. The process under the provisions of Section 82 of the Cr.P.C. has already been issued.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the petitioner is not entitled for privilege of anticipatory bail and accordingly, the same is *rejected*.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

A.K.V.//-

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

