

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.61342 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-165 Year-2025 Thana- PURNEA SADAR District- Purnia

Dilip Kumar Aaich S/o Late Chitranjan Aaich, R/o Vasantbagh, Naka Chouk,
Purnea City, P.S.- Sadar, District- Purnea

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sachina, Adv.

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 10-09-2025 Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Sadar P.S. Case No.165 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 316(2) and 306 of the BNS.

3. The allegation against the petitioner is of stealthily misappropriated the goods from the warehouse of the informant, while working as Godown In-charge.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner contended that the petitioner was neither In-charge of the stock register nor had exclusive excess or authority over the storage or dispatch of goods. The warehouse, in question, was supervised and managed by a team comprising several employees. From the FIR, it would be evident that the alleged occurrence took place



on 26.03.2025 whereas the FIR came to be lodged on 01.04.2025 without any unexplained delay. He further contended that the FIR is completely silent regarding availability or verification of the occurrence through the CCTV footage, security logs, entry registers or any eyewitness account that could establish the petitioner's direct involvement in the alleged misappropriation of goods. The FIR also discloses that the petitioner had been working in the warehouse for the last 18-19 years and there had never been any complaint; moreover, the petitioner bears fair antecedent and he undertakes that he will fully cooperate in the investigation and the proceeding of the Court.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State vehemently opposed the bail application.

6. Having considered the submissions set forth by the learned Advocate for the respective parties and taking note of the fact that the entire case is based on suspicion and circumstantial evidence and there is no independent verification or material evidence to support the claim of misappropriation, coupled with the fair antecedent, let the above named petitioner, be released on bail, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from



today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Punrea in connection with Sadar P.S. Case No.165 of 2025, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS, with further condition that one of the bailors shall be the own/close family members of the petitioner.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

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

