

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.75603 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-124 Year-2025 Thana- PHULPARAS District- Madhubani

Santosh Kumar Yadav @ Santosh Yadav Son of Golhai Yadav R/o Village -
Navtol, P.S. - Phulparas, Dist. - Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Hriday Narayan Harshit, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Satya Nand Shukla, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 20-11-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Phulparas P.S. Case No. 124 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 309(4) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that he was intercepted by four unknown motorcycles
borne criminals who looted the truck on point of pistol, further
one of the motorcycles was a KTM bike and also assaulted him
and snatched Rs. 12,000/-.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR
was against unknown and the petitioner came to be implicated
based on confessional statement of apprehended accused in



police custody which does not have any evidentiary value.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that it is a case of road robbery and the informant specifically alleges that he was assaulted and Rs. 12,000/- was snatched and the truck was looted at the point of pistol. It is further submitted that no doubt petitioner is a person with clean antecedent, but then in the anticipatory bail application nothing has been pleaded that as to what the petitioner does. It is next submitted that investigation of the case is in its nascent stages and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

