

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.76285 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-185 Year-2015 Thana- BARACHATTI District- Gaya

Manoj Kumar @ Manoj Yadav S/O Hura Yadav @ Jhaman Yadav Resident of
Village- Kathautia, Post- Patluka, P.S.- Barachatty, Distt.- Gaya, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhijeet Abhigyan
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Shaheen Begum

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 27-11-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Barachatty P.S. Case No.185/2015 dated 12.05.2015,
registered for the offence punishable under Section 394 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that he was coming home on his motorcycle when he
was intercepted by two unknown accused who looted his
motorcycle and Rs.20,000/- on point of pistol.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR
was against unknown and the name of the petitioner transpired
in the confessional statement of Deepak in police custody,



which does not have any evidentiary value. It is next submitted that the case is of the year 2015 and the police never knocked the door of the petitioner for arresting him as such the petitioner was not even aware of his involvement in the occurrence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the case is of the year 2015 and the petitioner in the anticipatory bail application has not pleaded as to what he does for earning his living. It is submitted that it is a case of road robbery and in the confessional statement of Deepak, the name of the petitioner has transpired and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner at this stage, the petitioner may abscond.

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

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

