

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.77777 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-42 Year-2024 Thana- CHIRAIYA District- East Champaran

Chandan Sahani Son of Gajendra Sahani R/o Village -Chand Parsa, P.S. -  
Kesaraiya, District - East Champarn.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Madhurendra Kumar, Advocate  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Shakir Ahmad, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      02-12-2025                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
APP for the State.

2. Petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered  
for the offence punishable under Section 395 of the Indian Penal  
Code.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the  
petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedents of two cases  
and the informant alleges that she came out of the bank after  
withdrawing an amount of Rs.49,000/- when she was  
intercepted by 3-4 unknown accused who snatched the bag  
containing the amount, on alarm, three accused were  
apprehended by Chowkidar and local people and they disclosed  
their names as Ramesh Sahni, Birendra Sahni and Jitendra  
Bhagat and also disclosed the number of vehicle by which they



had come to commit loot as BR06BR4582 and the name of the driver as Kalamuddin who fled with the car, further, Rs.49,000/- was recovered from Ramesh Sahni.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is not named in the FIR. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation, as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that three accused persons were apprehended at the spot and they disclosed the name of Kalamuddin and Surendra Sahni. It is further submitted that the apprehended accused did not disclose the name of the petitioner but subsequently during the course of investigation, Jitendra and Birendra in their confessional statement disclosed the name of the petitioner also. It is thus submitted that since petitioner has antecedent of two cases, as such, police got him implicated through Jitendra and Birendra in their confessional statement.

5. The learned APP vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that informant, a lady, alleges that she came out of the bank after withdrawing Rs.49,000/- when she was intercepted by unknown accused who snatched the amount, it is submitted that such occurrences are becoming a rampant. It is also submitted that though petitioner is not named in the FIR but during course of investigation his



name has transpired and he has criminal antecedents of two cases and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is hereby rejected in connection with Chiraiya P.S. Case No.42 of 2024, pending in the court of learned S.D.J.M., Sikarhana at Dhaka, East Champaran.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

*Sanjay/-*

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

