

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.75609 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-171 Year-2025 Thana- ARA NAGAR District- Bhojpur

Suraj Kumar @ Suraj Tiwari S/o Sanjay Tiwari R/o Village- An janpir
Chowk, Shaktinagar, P.S.- Hajipur Town, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Surendra Prasad Singh, 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 Town P.S. Case No. 171 of 2025 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 310(2) and 111(2) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that seven unknown accused persons entered the Tanishq
showroom and looted jewellery worth Rs. 10 Crores and the
entire occurrence was recorded in the CCTV and physical
description of the seven accused was noted in presence of the
district administration.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR
was against unknown. It is next submitted that the name of the
petitioner transpired in the case 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 committing dacoity at Tanishq showroom and ornaments worth Rs. 10 Crores was looted. It is also 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 offence is grave and serious and the 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	
---	--	---	--

