

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12872 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-11 Year-2024 Thana- Kotwali District- Darbhanga

1. Deepak Kumar @ Deepak Sahni S/O Suresh Sahni @ Suresh Sahani R/O Village- Bara Bharti, P.S- Minapur, Distt.- Muzaffarpur.
2. Chandan Sahni S/O Pramod Sahni R/O Village- Madhuban Kanti, P.S- Minapur, Distt.- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arun Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ram Sevak Choudhary, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

2 25-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Kotwali P.S. Case No. 11 of 2024 instituted for the offence under Sections 379 & 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The informant reported that on 25/05/2024, while her husband was withdrawing money at Donar SBI ATM, four unknown persons entered and watched the transaction. They allegedly swapped his ATM card with that of one Surendar Prasad Mandal. Subsequently, the accused illegally withdrew Rs. 94,669/- on 25/05/2024 and Rs. 92,800/- on 26/05/2024.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have falsely been implicated in the present case. The name of the petitioners transpired in this case on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused Ratnesh Kumar Tiwari.



Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that general and omnibus allegation has been made against the petitioners. No specific overt act is alleged against the petitioners. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioners that the petitioner no.1 has five criminal antecedent, whereas petitioner No.2 has five criminal antecedents.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioners. He further submitted that petitioners have several criminal antecedents, therefore, they do not deserve to be released on anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as considering the criminal antecedent of petitioners, as mentioned in para-3 of the application, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners are, hereby, rejected.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

