

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10154 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-64 Year-2024 Thana- SINDHUGAR District- Gaya

Sandeep Kumar Son of Raghu Yadav Resident of village - Jarlahi, P.S.-
Sindugarh, District - Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Satya Veer

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Kumar Ranjit Ranjan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 04-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in Sindugarh P. S. Case
No.64 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under
Section 394 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is in custody since 30.10.2025 and is a person
with clean antecedent. It is next submitted that informant alleges
that two unknown accused intercepted him on 12.06.2024 at
7.00 P.M. while he was returning home on his motorcycle and
on point of gun looted his mobile, Rs.20,500/- and the
motorcycle.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is not named in the FIR and during course of
investigation his name transpired in the confession of Vikram in



police custody, which does not have any evidentiary value.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the bail application and submits that name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of Vikram but then looted motorcycle was recovered from the house of Vikram and Vikram in his confession before the police accepted his participation in the occurrence along with the petitioner.

6. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner does not dispute the said submission of the learned APP, but then submits that petitioner is a student and is a young boy aged about 21 years and in support of the fact that petitioner is a student, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner relies on an Annexure-2 to the bail application.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on regular bail.

8. The prayer of the petitioner for regular bail stands rejected.

9. However, petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

