

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15566 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-142 Year-2020 Thana- SHRIKRISHNAPURI District- Patna

Vishal Kumar @ Monti @ Vishal Pratap S/o Late Samir Kumar Jayaswal R/o
Gate no. 1, DVC Chowk, Gardanibagh, P.S.- Gardanibagh, Distt.- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Aashit Sinha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, 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, Mr. Rabindra Kumar.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 356, 379 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 66(c) of the Information Technology Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the informant alleges that on 01.06.2020 at about 06:25 PM while she was on her evening walk at Boring Road, Patna, her purse containing Rs. 1,000/- in cash along with her mobile was snatched by two unknown persons on a motorcycle, further on the same day at about 08:00 PM, an amount of Rs. 1 Lakh was transferred from her bank account to the said stolen mobile.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR is against unknown and the name of the petitioner transpired during the course of investigation in the confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value. It is further submitted that petitioner for earning his livelihood is residing at Hyderabad.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and submits that it is a case of snatching based on which cyber crime was also committed, no doubt name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of apprehended accused, but then the investigation of the case is continuing. It is also submitted that no doubt at Para-14 of the anticipatory bail application, it has been pleaded that petitioner for earning his livelihood stays at Hyderabad, but then the anticipatory bail application is completely silent with regard to the fact that where the petitioner works and resides at Hyderabad which amply demonstrates that only for creating a defence, the said plea has been taken. It is further submitted that petitioner has antecedent of two cases and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, 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	
---	--	---	--

