

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18779 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-210 Year-2025 Thana- KURSAILA District- Katihar

Chhotu Kumar @ Chhotu Kumar Yadav Son of Late Vinod Yadav R/o
Kursela, P.S. - Kursela, Distt.- Katihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ramchandra Sahni, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Kursela P.S. Case No.210/2025, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 317(3), 317(5) and 3(5) of the
B.N.S., 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that on information, the house of the accused was raided
and Nitish was apprehended with the stolen motorcycle who
disclosed that his brother Chotu (petitioner) and Abhay are also
involved in committing theft and sale of stolen motorcycle.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the



informant based on confessional statement of his brother Nitish in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value. It is also submitted that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the order impugned, it would manifest that the same records that petitioner has antecedent of one case but the petitioner in the instant anticipatory bail application has pleaded that he is a person with clean antecedent at Para-3. It is also submitted that name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of apprehended accused but then the allegation is of committing theft of motorcycle and selling the same as such the investigation and interrogation of the accused is required. It is also submitted that there is no averment in the anticipatory bail application to establish the bonafide of the petitioner with regard to his profession.

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

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.



(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

