

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.85051 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-120 Year-2024 Thana- DIGHALBANK District- Kishanganj

Aman Kumar Son of Sunil Yadav Resident of Jaldia ,P.S- Jadia, District-
Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr .Dilip Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the State : Mr. Manoj Kumar, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

4 18-06-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Dighalbank P.S. Case No. 120 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 109(1), 311, 312 of the BNS, 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The allegation in the FIR is that the informant was robbed of his belongings including the cash which he was carrying in his bag at gun point by three miscreants who came on a motorcycle and when they did not succeed in the same, one of them even opened fire upon the informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the FIR was lodged against unknown and the name of the petitioner subsequently transpired during the course of investigation on



the basis of the confessional statement of the apprehended co-accused persons, namely, Vikash Kumar and Jeewan Kumar. It is further submitted that it appears from bare perusal of the case diary that on disclosure made by one of the accused persons, namely, Arvind Kumar, some articles were recovered from the house of co-accused Vikash Kumar and upon disclosure made by co-accused Vikash Kumar, some looted cash and mobile phones were recovered from the house of co-accused Jeewan Kumar. Further, it also appears that from the house of the petitioner also, some looted cash was recovered. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, however, submits that barring the confessional statement of the apprehended co-accused persons made before the police, there is no other material collected against the petitioner to connect him with the present offence.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail submitting that there is recovery of looted cash from the house of the petitioner and further, in the entire transaction, gun shot has been fired upon the informant and he has sustained a bullet injury which has subsequently found to be grievous in nature.

6. Taking into consideration the fact that the matter relates to an organized crime and the petitioner seems to be an



accomplice along with the other accused persons, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

7. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

divyanshi/-

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

