

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22988 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-93 Year-2025 Thana- HATHIDAH District- Patna

=====

Ranjan Kumar Son of Dayaram @ Dayaram Prasad Resident of village-
Jansare,P.S-Pandaul, Distt-Madhubani P/A- Residing At village- Ramnagar
Mahmood Road, Ps- Gohana, dist- Sonipat

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mrs. Kumari Pallavi, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 13-07-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and

the learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Hathidah P.S. Case No. 93 of 2025, for allegedly having committed offence under Sections 309(4) and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. As per the prosecution story, which has been lodged on the basis of the written report submitted by the informant to the effect that on 22.09.2021, the driver of the informant told him that a person, who is known to him, has met with an accident and therefore, he required the four wheeler vehicle of the informant. When the driver did not returned, he called on his mobile number, however the same was found to be



switched off. The informant called the son of the driver, who told him that he is in Bengal and will enquire about his father's whereabouts after returning in the night. On 23.09.2025, the driver of the informant reached near *Sindeswhar* and informed that one Vikash Kumar along with three unknown persons looted/snatched the car of the informant by showing pistol and also took away the mobile phone of the driver.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence. He further submits that the petitioner was not named in the first information report and his name transpired in the present case on the basis of the statement made by one of the co-accused Vijay Kumar, who was apprehended by the Police and on whose confessional statement, the vehicle was also recovered. He submits that the petitioner has got no concern with Vijay Kumar and he was not even involved in the snatching of the vehicle. He further submits that the petitioner was not even present at the place of occurrence and the petitioner has got a clean antecedent.

5. Per contra, the learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner was involved in snatching the vehicle



from the driver and his name transpired in the confessional statement of the co-accused Vijay Kumar.

6. Having heard the rival submissions and after going through the record, it appears that the vehicle of the informant was snatched/looted at gun point, for which, first information report was lodged. During course of investigation, the name of one of the co-accused Vijay Kumar transpired and after he was apprehended. He gave his confessional statement before the Police, wherein he named the petitioner and three other persons. On the confessional statement made by the co-accused co-accused Vijay Kumar, the vehicle in question was recovered and later on, released in favour of the informant. From perusal of the case diary it appears that except the confessional statement of Vijay Kumar, made before the Police during course of investigation, nothing has come during course of investigation to suggest that the petitioner was also involved in snatching/looting the vehicle. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned I/C A.C.J.M. III, Barh, Patna in



connection with Hatidah P.S. Case No. 93 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S., with further condition:

(1) The learned Court concerned shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedents, the court concerned shall take steps for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Ritesh Kumar, J)

AjayMishra/-

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

