

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.73282 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-102 Year-2025 Thana- GANGABRIDGE District- Vaishali

Sonu Kumar S/O Late Arjun Singh Resident of Bariyarpur Gaushpur
Bariyarpur Bishunpur Balbhadar, P.S.- Raja Pakar, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shivanand Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nitya Nand Tiwary

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 05-12-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Ganga Bridge P.S. Case No. 102 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 111, 112 and 303(2) of the
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that unknown accused committed theft of his tractor
loaded with sand.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
FIR was against unknown and the name of the petitioner
transpired in the confessional statement of Amit in police
custody, which does not have any evidentiary value. It is



reiterated and submitted that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that no doubt the name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of Amit Ranjan, but then Amit and Pinku were arrested and based on the confessional statement of Pinku, the tractor was recovered. It is also submitted that similarly situated co-accused Raja Kumar @ Rana Ankit @ Rana Ankit Raja had moved this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.64265/2025 and the same came to be rejected by an order dated 25.09.2025. It is next submitted that the case of the petitioner is similar to the case of Raja Kumar and investigation of the case is still continuing.

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

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

