

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.21102 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-899 Year-2025 Thana- HAJIPUR SADAR District- Vaishali

Sonal Raj, Son of Shambhu Kumar @ Shambhu Kumar Sah, Resident of
Village- Gadai Sarai, P.S.- Sadar Hajipur, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shanti Bhushan Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Narsingh Tanti, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 20-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. In the present case, the petitioner seeks bail in connection with Hajipur Sadar P.S. Case No. 899 of 2025, registered for the alleged offence under Section 309(4) of BNS.

3. As per prosecution case, while the informant had been going to deposit Rs.1,56,540/- to the State Bank of India after collecting the same from one of the Flipkart branches, three persons in a black colour pulsar motorcycle robbed him at gunpoint. The name of the petitioner came up during investigation for being involved in the said occurrence along with other co-accused persons.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this



case. Nothing incriminating has been recovered from the person/possession of the petitioner. The petitioner had been working on the post of cashier in the Flipkart branch from which money was collected and no complaints have been made against him during his employment. The recovery of looted money and mobile phone has been made from other co-accused persons and not from the petitioner. The petitioner has been implicated in this case on mere suspicion. The other co-accused persons have been identified by the informant during Test Identification Parade. Only on the ground that the petitioner was talking to one of the co-accused Subham Kumar, he has been made accused in this case. The petitioner is in custody since 06.12.2025 and is having antecedent of one case.

5. The learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the submission made on behalf of the petitioner. The learned APP submits that from the CCTV footage, it has come that while the petitioner was handing over cash to the informant, at the same time, he had been talking on his mobile phone and later on, it came during investigation that he was talking to one of the co-accused from which recovery has been made. The learned APP further submits that the petitioner while working as cashier gave information to the other co-accused persons, who



subsequently looted the informant and the petitioner was also involved in similar type of occurrence earlier as well.

6. Having regard to the fact that the petitioner being in fiduciary relationship in the company breached the trust and conspired with other co-accused persons in the robbery, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, his prayer for grant of bail is rejected.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

V.K.Pandey/-

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

