

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25460 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-689 Year-2025 Thana- DANAPUR District- Patna

Satendra Kumar Rai @ Satyendra Rai S/o Sumeshwar Rai R/o Village-
Bhabuana Ward No.4, P.S- Charpokhari, Dist- Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Aditi Medha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Raj Ballabh Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

2 17-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 317(5)
of the B.N.S.

3. The present application has been filed renewing the
prayer for bail in view of the liberty granted to the petitioner
vide order dated 11.02.2026 passed by this Court to approach
the Court after framing of charge.

4. Petitioner is said to be involved in cheating by
exchanging ATM cards and withdrawing money through
fraudulent ATM transactions.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted
that the allegation in the present case involves recovery of a
mobile phone and some ATM cards from the possession of the



petitioner for which he has tendered no explanation. It has further been submitted that there is only a general allegation made in the First Information Report that he is involved in some fraudulent activities with regard to ATM but the fact is that such assumption has been made only on the basis of the fact that some recovery has been made from his possession. However, the attention of this Court has been drawn to the seizure list which does not bear the signature of any independent witness. Further, the petitioner is in custody since 03.07.2025 and the charges have already been framed on 17.03.2026 (Annexure-p/4). It is further submitted that there is no possibility of tampering of any evidence as ATM cards etc. are all in the possession of the Investigating Agency and the petitioner undertakes to cooperate in the trial.

6. Learned APP for the State has opposed the application for bail on the ground that there are several criminal antecedents upon this petitioner. However, in response, it has been submitted that the petitioner is on bail in all the cases and the offences are mostly magistrate triable cases.

7. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances and also considering the fact that the present case concerns recovery of some ATM cards which have already been



seized, as such there appears no possibility of tampering any evidence, let the above named petitioner, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Danapur P.S. Case No. 689 of 2025, subject to the conditions that:

(I) One of the bailors would be the family member or relative.

(II) The petitioner would appear physically on each and every date in the learned court below and would cooperate in the conclusion of trial and if the petitioner does not appear on two consecutive dates without any substantial and satisfactory reason, the learned court below would be at liberty to cancel his bail bonds.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

devendra/-

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

