

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.81466 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-176 Year-2025 Thana- DAUDNAGAR District- Aurangabad

Amit Kumar S/o Bintesh Singh Resident of Village - Yadav Tolla, Nasriganj,
P.S - Nasriganj, District - Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shiv Pratap, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Abhay Kumar Roy, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

2 16-12-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Daudnagar P.S. Case No. 176 of 2025, instituted for the offences punishable under Section 309(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that three unknown persons intercepted the informant on a motorcycle, pushed him and fled away from the spot by taking informant's motorcycle.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the



present case. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. The petitioner has been remanded in this case from Nasriganj P.S. Case No. 163 of 2025 in which he has confessed his guilt and the same has got no evidentiary value. It is further submitted that no any recovery has been made from the possession of the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 06.06.2025 and has got two criminal antecedents.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that on perusal of paragraph no. 46 of the case diary, it transpires that the petitioner has confessed his guilt in Nasriganj P.S. Case No. 163 of 2025 and the looted motorcycle has been recovered from the Police Station. It is further submitted that the allegation levelled against the petitioner is serious in nature. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial. However, if the trial is not concluded within a



period of four months from the date of receipt/production, the petitioner will have liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the Court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

