

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64621 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-864 Year-2023 Thana- BEUR District- Patna
=====

Ram Bhawan Paswan @ Rambhawan Paswan S/o Chatrabali Paswan R/o
Village- Andari, P.S.- Gaurichak, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s
=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Madhukar Anand, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary,APP
=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 12-11-2025 Heard Mr. Madhukar Anand, learned Advocate for

the petitioner and Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary, learned

Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Beur P.S. Case No. 864 of 2023 for the offences punishable under Sections 395, 397, 307, 353, 342, 120B of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 and 35 of the Arms Act.

3. In course of police patrolling, on receipt of an information regarding commission of loot, the police conducted raid and apprehended three persons. The apprehended persons disclosed the name of their accomplice, including the name of the petitioner. Various



other incriminating materials and arms were also recovered from their possession.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner, vehemently, contended that save and except disclosure made by the apprehended persons, there is no material suggesting the complicity of the petitioner. However, even if, the allegation or the disclosure taken to be true, the same is not admissible in the eyes of law. Moreover, during course of the investigation, no scientific evidence has been placed on record suggesting the petitioner's complicity in the crime. The reason behind the false implication of the petitioner is said to be criminal antecedents as has been disclosed in paragraph-3 of the bail application. It is further contended that nothing incriminating material has been recovered from the whereabouts of the petitioner; this also strengthen the aforenoted submissions.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State, vehemently, opposed the bail application and submits that three persons were apprehended while they were committing dacoity along with others in a mobile tower and from whose possession various incriminating materials have been recovered; and it is they who have disclosed the name of the



petitioner, besides two criminal antecedents.

6. Regard being had to the submissions set forth by the learned Advocate for the respective parties, this Court does not accede to the prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same stands rejected.

7. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the court below, preferably, within a period of four weeks from today, learned jurisdictional Court shall consider the prayer for bail of the petitioner considering the submissions of the petitioner made before this Court without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

brajesh/-

(Harish Kumar, J)

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

