

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20862 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-64 Year-2024 Thana- SINDHUGAR District- Gaya

=====

Gorelal Kumar @ Gorelal @ Gorelal Yadav Son of Late Raushan Yadav R/o
Village - Manik Chak, P.S. - Mohanpur, Dist. - Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Binod Kumar Sinha
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 11-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State Mr. Rabindra Kumar.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in Sindugarh P. S. Case
No.64 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under
Section 394 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody
since 26.12.2025 and the informant alleges that on 12.06.2024
at 7.00 P.M. while he was returning home on his motorcycle,
when he was intercepted by two unknown accused persons and
one accused assaulted him by lathi and the other accused on
point of pistol looted his mobile, Rs.20,500/- and the
motorcycle.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR
is against unknown and the name of petitioner transpired during



the course of investigation in the confession statement of Vikram in police custody, which does not have any evidentiary value.

5. Learned A.P.P. Mr. Rabindra Kumar opposes the bail application and submits that the looted mobile was recovered from Vikram and he disclosed the name of petitioner that he was also involved in the occurrence of loot and Vikram from the looted mobile was in touch with petitioner, Sandeep and Prince. It is also submitted that informant alleges that he was looted by two unknown accused and the looted mobile was recovered from Vikram and he disclosed the name of petitioner being associate, who was also involved in the occurrence.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on regular bail.

7. The regular bail application of the petitioner stands rejected.

8. However, petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge since he is a person with clean antecedent.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

