

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.45862 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-608 Year-2024 Thana- PHULWARISHARIF District- Patna

Dhananjay @ Dhananjay Kumar @ Golu @ Golu Kumar son of Vikramaditya
Dubey Resident of Village-Adhapa P.S-Janipur District-Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms.Usha Kumari Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Binod Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 230-07-2025
1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail, arises out of Phulwarisharif (Janipur O.P.) Police Station Case No. 608 of 2024, dated 28.04.2024, disclosing offences punishable under Sections 380/457/511 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, as per the First Information Report, is that the petitioner along with two other accused persons were seen committing theft and two of them were apprehended by the villagers and handed over to the police. It has further been alleged that the accused persons, including the petitioner, have earlier committed theft in the houses of Sunil Singh, Awadh Dubey,



Mithilesh Mishra and Shiv Temple. It has further been stated that due to the fear of theft, the villagers avoid to go out of the village.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence in the manner alleged. He further submits that the petitioner has got no criminal antecedent and the name of the petitioner transpired in this case merely on suspicion by the informant. He further submits that no incriminating material has been recovered from the arrested co-accused persons and from perusal of the impugned order, it would also be evident that the arrested co-accused persons had not taken the name of the petitioner.
5. I have heard learned Counsel for the parties concerned and have perused the material available on record, including the impugned order.
6. From perusal of the impugned order, it transpires that the petitioner is specifically named by the informant in the First Information Report, along with two other accused persons, as the persons who were committing theft in the house by breaking the lock, who were apprehended by the villagers while the petitioner succeeded in fleeing away.



7. Considering the above, I do not find any reason to differ with the findings arrived at by the learned 19th Additional Sessions Judge, Patna, inasmuch as the case is under investigation, wherein the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may be necessary based upon the material collected by the police during course of investigation. As such, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
8. This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	✓	T	✓
---	---	---	---

