

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3710 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-226 Year-2025 Thana- DARPA District- East Champaran

Anand Kumar S/o Paras Prasad Chaurasiya Resident of Village - Gamhariya
Kala, P.S - Darpa, District - East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Prateek Tandon, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Surendra Kumar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Shakil Ahmad Khan, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL DUTTA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

5 21-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Darpa P.S. Case No. 226 of 2025 registered under Sections 331(4) and 305 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. As per the prosecution case, on 09.09.2025 at about 04:30 A.M., some unknown miscreants entered in the house of the informant and committed theft of ornaments, cash and mobile. Informant identified petitioner and co-accused Pradeep Kumar while they were fleeing away.

4. Submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case due to previous enmity and village politics.



Further submission is that petitioner and informant are next door neighbours and there is dispute between them regarding drainage. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Petitioner has got one criminal antecedent of similar nature in which he is on bail. He undertakes to cooperate in the investigation and trial.

5. Learned A.P.P. appearing on behalf of the State and learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail by contending that petitioner is named accused and there is direct allegation against him that he along with co-accused persons burgled the house of the informant. Co-accused Pradeep Kumar in his confessional statement has stated the name of the petitioner and accepted the complicity of the petitioner in the crime. From perusal of para-13 of the case diary, it transpires that as per disclosure of co-accused Pradeep Kumar, some stolen articles have been recovered and the same has been handed over to the informant. It is further contended that informant herself identified the petitioner while he was fleeing away with co-accused Pradeep Kumar after committing theft. Petitioner has got one criminal antecedent of similar nature. Hence, he does not deserve to be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

6. Having considered that the informant has



identified the petitioner and co-accused on spot while fleeing away after committing theft, recovery of stolen items on confessional statement of co-accused, who also admitted the involvement of petitioner in the offence and also criminal antecedent of similar nature, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Sunil Dutta Mishra, J)

utkarsh/-

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

