

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13000 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-102 Year-2025 Thana- LALGANJ District- Vaishali

Arun Sah Son of Krishna Sah Resident of Village- Gurmiya (Chandwara),
P.S.- Kartaha, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Siyaram Shahi, Advocate Mr. Balgovind Sharma, Advocate Ms. Shabima Talat, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 23-02-2026 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 Lalganj P.S. Case No. 102 of 2025 registered for the offence under Sections 310(2) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner has been rejected vide order dated 09.07.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 39504 of 2025, which reads as under:

*“Heard the learned counsel for the
petitioners and learned APP for the State.*

*2. The petitioners seek regular bail in
connection with Lalganj P.S. Case No. 102 of
2025 registered for the offence under Sections
310(2) of the B.N.S., 2023.*

*3. As per the prosecution case,
unknown criminals have committed dacoity of
Rs.18 lakh cash and gold ornaments. They have
looted Rs.1 lakh from the cash counter. The*



name of the petitioners have come in the self inculpatory statement of co-accused Baidhnath Sahni. The looted gold jewellery and money has been recovered from the petitioners.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have not committed any offence. She submits that one of the co-accused person has been granted bail. The petitioners are in custody since 18.04.2025.

5. Learned A.P.P. appearing for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, this application for regular bail is hereby rejected.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the charge has been framed on 10.09.2025.

5. Considering the gravity of the offence, the fact that the trial has started and also the fact that no fresh ground for grant of bail is made out, I am not inclined to review my earlier order.

6. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

7. If the trial is delayed by the prosecution, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

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

