

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-620 Year-2024 Thana- SHASTRINAGAR District- Patna

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-620 Year-2024 Thana- SHASTRINAGAR District- Patna

Amit Kumar Son of Devendra Poddar R/o Kharjamma, Ward No.- 5, P.S.-
Mahkar, Dist.- Vaishali, Bihar - 844506

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Madan Mohan, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

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

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Shastrinagar P.S. Case No. 620 of 2024, instituted for the offences punishable under Sections 303(2) and 134 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the petitioner along with other co-accused person have snatched a gold chain from the informant's neck.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel for



the petitioner also submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. Name of the petitioner has transpired in this case on the basis of confessional statement made by co-accused, namely, Sujeet Kumar Paswan and the same has got no evidentiary value. It is further submitted that the looted article has not been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 10.03.2025 and has got thirteen criminal antecedents.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits however, the petitioner is not named in the FIR but name of the petitioner has transpired in this case on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused, namely, Sujeet Kumar Paswan. It is next submitted that the petitioner is shopkeeper of a jewellery shop and is habitually dealing with the sell and purchase of stolen articles. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail. Learned APP for the State further submits that regular bail of similarly situated co-accused has been rejected by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 24.09.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 66408 of 2025.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence,



this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial. However, if the trial is not concluded within a period of three months from the date of receipt/production, the petitioner will have liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the Court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

