

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44937 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-248 Year-2025 Thana- CHAPRA TOWN District- Saran

Krishna Kumar Singh @ Krishna Kumar Son of kamlesh Singh R/o -
Katharibag, P.S - Chapra Town, District - Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Jha, Advocate

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

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 18-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Town
P.S. Case No. 248 of 2025, instituted for the offences punishable
under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 303(2), 60 of the Bharatiya
Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and later on added Section 317(2) of the
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 was added.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that some
unknown persons committed theft of Rs. 70 lakh from the cash-
box when the petitioner along with gun-man Shailendra Singh
had gone to collect cash inside the building of I.C.I.C.I. Bank.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the
present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. No



incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence. Name of the petitioner has transpired in this case on the basis of confessional statement made by co-accused person and the same has got no evidentiary value. No any looted amount has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. It is further submitted that the entire money i.e. cash of Rs. 70 lakh has been recovered from the possession of co-accused Sonu Kumar Singh. The petitioner is in custody since 12.05.2025 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, stating that the offence alleged is serious in nature. He further submits that the name of the petitioner has transpired in this case on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused person. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial. However, if the trial is not concluded within a



period of four months from the date of receipt/production, the petitioner will have liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the Court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

