

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10622 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-912 Year-2023 Thana- SASARAM NAGAR District- Rohtas

Rajnikant Pandey S/o Triloki Pandey @ Trilokinath Pandey R/o Village-
Bimari, P.S- Sahpur, Dist- Arrah, (Bhojpur).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sheo Jee Mishra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Sumiran Rai, A.P.P.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

2 13-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Sasaram Town P.S. Case No. 912 of 2023, instituted for the offences under Sections 406, 420, 349 and 120(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that petitioner along with other co-accused namely Gopal and Ramjeet Yadav have stolen the truck of the informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submitted that alleged truck was stolen by its driver and cleaner. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that general and omnibus allegation has been made against the



petitioner. He further submitted that an information petition has been filed in the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bhojpur at Ara by one Pramod Kumar Pandey stating therein that Rajnikant Pandey (Petitioner) is the business partner of the applicant. There is no specific allegation against the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that other co-accused has been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 23.04.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 20500 of 2025. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and nature of allegation, in my view, this is not a fit case for anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

