

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68090 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-78 Year-2016 Thana- KOTWA District- East Champaran

1. Randhir Kumar @ Randhir Bhagat S/O Sunil Bhagat Resident of Village- Bhathanal, P.S.- Motipur, District- East Champaran.
2. Lalu Bhagat S/O Birendra Bhagat Resident of Village- Bhathanal, P.S.- Motipur, District- East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dhurendra Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad- A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 13-10-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State.
2. The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their arrest in Kotwa P. S. Case No.78 of 2016 registered for the offences punishable under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that four unknown miscreants intercepted him and his driver and looted mobile and Bolero pick-up vehicle.
4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that FIR was against unknown and the name of the petitioners transpired in the confessional statement of Rahul in police custody, which does not have any evidentiary value. It is next submitted



that a specific pleading has been made at Para-9 of the anticipatory bail application that petitioners reside with their family at Gujrat and Haryana and are doing private job.

5. Learned A.P.P. Sri Chandra Bhushan Prasad vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that it is a case of road robbery. It is next submitted that no doubt, at Para-9, it has been pleaded that petitioners reside at Gujrat and Haryana and do private job, but then, address where they reside is not given nor the description of the work place is pleaded, which cast an aspersion on the defence of the petitioner. It is also submitted that investigation is continuing. It is next submitted that the case is of the Year 2016 and in the event, if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioners, may abscond.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. The prayer of the petitioners for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

