

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7190 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-114 Year-2025 Thana- CHAND District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

Uma Prasad Son of Loknath Resident of Village- Gayapur, P.S.- Sahebganj,
District- Chandauli (U.P.)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jay Prakash Singh, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Md. Nazir Ansari, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 16-02-2026 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 Chand P.S.Case No. 114 of 2025 registered for the offence punishable under Section 309 of the BNS.

3. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner has been rejected vide order dated 09.07.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 39838 of 2025, which reads as under:-

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

*2. This application has been
filed on behalf of the petitioner for grant of
regular bail in connection with Chand P.S.
Case No. 114 of 2025 registered for the
offence under Section 309(4) of the BNS,*



2023.

3. *As per the prosecution case, unknown criminals dashed their motorcycle and looted Rs. 1,90,000/- from the informant.*

4. *Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 3.5.2025 and he has clean antecedent.* 5. *Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that one co-accused Suraj Chauhan has already been granted bail by this Court.*

6. *Learned counsel for the State has opposed the application of the petitioner for grant of bail and has submitted that during investigation, one Arvind Ram was caught and Rs. 15,000/- of the looted amount was recovered from him. He further submits that the informant side had made a video of the motorcycle which was found fleeing and in the video the registration number of the motorcycle was also captured. He further submits that in the self-inculpatory statement, Arvind Ram has named the petitioner as the owner of the motorcycle which was used in the loot. In the tower location also, the presence of the petitioner has also come on the place of occurrence.*

7. *Considering the participation of the petitioner in the alleged crime and also considering the materials available on record, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.*

8. *Accordingly, this application is dismissed.”*



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the charge has been framed and out of 6 witnesses, 2 witnesses have been examined.

5. Considering the gravity of offence and the fact that the trial has started, the petitioner does not deserve bail in view of the law laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of *X Vs. State of Rajasthan and Anr. Reported in 2024 SCC online SC 3539*.

6. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

N.K/-

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

