

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5415 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-175 Year-2024 Thana- AURANGABAD TOWN District-
Aurangabad

=====

Sudhanshu Kumar Bhardwaj @ Sudhanshu Bhardwaj @ Tamatar @ Tamatar
Lal Son of Bhola Singh Resident Of Village -Utrama, PS- Khizarsarai, Distt.-
Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Praveen Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr.Raj Kishor Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 27-06-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. This is the second attempt on behalf of the
petitioner for grant of bail in connection with Aurangabad
(Town) P.S. Case No. 175 of 2024 registered for the offence
punishable under Sections 420, 379, 413, 414/34 of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner has
been rejected vide order dated 10.07.2024 passed in Cr. Misc.
No. 47777 of 2024 which reads as follows:

*“Heard learned counsel for the
petitioner and learned APP for the State.*

*2. The petitioner seeks bail in
connection with Aurangabad (Town) P.S. Case
No. 175 of 2024 registered for the offence under*



Sections 420, 379, 413, 414/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, when the police reached the HDFC ATM, they found some persons standing there. On seeing the police, two persons fled away on Motorcycle and one person (the petitioner) after coming out of the ATM also started running but he caught by the police.

4. The petitioner disclosed the names of the other accused persons and from the possession of the petitioner 6 ATM cards, one aluminium foil and one mobile phone has been recovered.

5. The petitioner and other accused persons are involved in ATM fraud and cheating. The petitioner is in custody since 4.3.2024.

6. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case and the recovery is planted.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

9. The Court below is directed to expedite the trial of the petitioner and conclude the same at the earliest.”

4. In the trial till date out of four witnesses none has been examined though the petitioner is in custody since 04.03.2024.

5. This application is dismissed with a direction to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Gaya to ensure the appearance of the witnesses on the date fixed.

6. If the trial is still delayed by the prosecution, the



petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.

7. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Gaya and the Principal, District Judge, Gaya, forthwith through FAX or e-mail for its compliance.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

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

