

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15686 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-280 Year-2025 Thana- GOVINDGANJ District- East
Champaran

Chandan Singh @ Chandan Kumar S/o Sri Ram Naresh Singh R/o Village-
Madhopur Hazari, P.S- Sahebganj, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Thakur, Advocate

Mr. Shivam, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar No. 2, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

2 24-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4),
303(2), 336(4), 340(1), 340(2), 308(5), 61(2) and 111(1) of the
BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges
that petitioner called him on his mobile and introduced himself
as having business of jewellery and called him to Muzaffarpur for
buying jewellery, the informant went to Muzaffarpur and saw
jewellery worth crore of rupees and said that he will come back
with money, accordingly, the informant along with his friend
went to buy jewellery, but before reaching Muzaffarpur, made a
call when petitioner asked him to come near Areraj accordingly,



the informant along with his friend went to the place where he was called by the petitioner, further the petitioner took him to the house of Amresh and disclosed that the house is also for sale and showed jewellery, further petitioner in the meantime made a call when 7-8 accused on 3-4 motorcycles came and took Rs. 19 Lakhs along with other articles and started fleeing, when his friend caught an accused who disclosed his name as Surendra and also disclosed that petitioner, Amresh and others are part of organized gang who fled with the articles and cash.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is next submitted that the mobile from which the informant got a call does not belong to the petitioner. It is further submitted that even the informant deals in business of purchasing looted jewellery. It is next submitted that petitioner was engaged in business with one Neha Kumari, wife of the brother of the petitioner and the informant had given money to Neha but when the deal failed, the instant false case came to be instituted.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and submits that Neha is also an accused in the instant case. It is also



submitted that if informant is dealing in purchasing looted jewellery in that event the same would surface during the course of investigation and appropriate action would be taken, but then as far as the petitioner is concerned, the mobile may not belong to him, but when informant before reaching Muzaffarpur called him on the mobile from which he had received a call from the petitioner earlier, the same was picked by petitioner again. It is also submitted that the informant specifically alleges that petitioner along with others are operating an organized crime. It is next submitted that investigation of the case is continuing and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

