

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64608 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-487 Year-2015 Thana- BARH District- Patna

=====

Mahadev @ Ajit Yadav @ Amit Yadav S/o Chandradeo Yadav Resident of
Village- Beldhana, P.S.- Chandi, District- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Raj Kishor Prasad

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Madhura Nand Jha

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 17-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Barh P.S. Case No. 487 of 2015 registered for the offences punishable under Section 395 of IPC.

3. As per prosecution case, ten unknown miscreants entered into the house of informant after unlocking the door and after breaking the lock of the box, looted valuable ornaments and household items collectively valued at Rs. 1,50,000/- and fled away.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is not named in FIR and his name has been surfaced in this case upon the confessional statement of co-accused Sonu Kumar. He further submits that except disclosure of said co-



accused, there is nothing on record to demonstrate the complicity of the present petitioner with the alleged occurrence. Petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged in the FIR and he has falsely been implicated in this case. Petitioner bears criminal antecedent of two case of Section 392 of IPC and he is on bail in both the cases.

5. The learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner by submitting that the present case is lodged in the year 2015 and the name of the petitioner has come to fore during the course of investigation and till today petitioner has not participated in the investigation and investigation is still going on. Hence, at this juncture, petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail as besides the present case, petitioner is also having criminal antecedents of two cases of Section 392 of IPC which relates to robbery and the present case is more or less of similar nature.

6. . Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, keeping in view the criminal antecedents of two cases of Section 392 of IPC which relates to robbery which is more or less similar to the present case and petitioner has not participated in the investigation till today and the investigation is still going on, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of



anticipatory bail to the petitioner and accordingly, the same stands rejected.

8. However, petitioner is directed to surrender before the concerned court within six weeks from today and the concerned court may pass appropriate order on the day of hearing without being prejudiced by order of this Court.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

alok/-

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

