

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80383 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-448 Year-2024 Thana- SAMASTIPUR MUFFASIL District-  
Samastipur

=====

Ranjan Kumar @ Ranjan Sahni S/o Santosh Sahni R/o Village - Harpur  
Nizamat, P.S - Samastipur Muffasil, District - Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhay Shanker Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, A.P.P.

=====

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

2      09-12-2025                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and  
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case  
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 308(5),  
303(2) and 3(5) of the BNS as well as Section 27 of the Arms  
Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that  
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant  
alleges that on 22.10.2024, at 01:00 a.m., 4-5 unknown accused  
came at the work site of the informant while he along with his  
worker was sleeping and started abusing and assaulting and took  
away mobiles, key of vehicle along with money and fled firing.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the  
petitioner submits that FIR was against unknown and the name



of the petitioner transpired, during the course of investigation, on the ground that SIM of the petitioner was used in one of the looted mobiles after more than a month of the occurrence. It is further submitted that the petitioner works at Haryana and during the Diwali-Chhath had come to his house and had used the mobile of his brother by putting his SIM and, thus, came to be implicated. It is next submitted that petitioner was not knowing that his brother had purchased a stolen mobile.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that allegation is of committing loot. It is further submitted that whether petitioner was involved in the occurrence or not is an aspect of investigation. It is next submitted that it has been submitted on behalf of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that he had come home during holidays and had used his SIM in the mobile of his brother. It is, thus, submitted that it does not appear probable as to why the petitioner would have used the mobile of his brother when he was having his own mobile which is also an aspect of investigation. It is next submitted that whether petitioner works outside Bihar or not is also an aspect of investigation.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned



A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Samastipur Mufassil P.S. Case No. 448 of 2024, pending in the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-II, Samastipur/Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

Kundan/-

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

