

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32580 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-109 Year-2023 Thana- CHACKMEHSI District- Samastipur

Pandab Paswan @ Pandat Paswan @ Pandap Paswan S/o Maksudan Paswan
R/o Village - Sakhaura, Ward No. 12, P.S - Piyar Hattha O.P, District -
Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sriram Krishna, Adv.

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 19-06-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. This is the 3rd attempt of the petitioner seeking bail
in connection with Chakmehsi P.S. Case No. 109 of 2023
registered for the offence under Sections 394, 302/34 of the
I.P.C. read with Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Earlier, the bail application of the petitioner was
rejected on 19.07.2024 in Cr. Misc. No. 48427 of 2024 which
reads as follows:-

*“The defect as pointed out by the office is
ignored.*

*2. The following order was passed on
13.12.2023:*

*“Heard learned counsel
appearing on behalf of the petitioner
and learned APP appearing on
behalf of the State.*



2. Let the defect(s), if any, be removed within a period of four weeks from today.

3. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Chakmehsi P.S. Case No. 109 of 2023 registered for the offence under Sections 394, 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

4. As per the prosecution case, a person carrying money was stopped, money was looted by the unknown criminals and he was shot by the criminals and it has come during investigation that the petitioner has participated in the crime.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that except for the confessional statement of the co-accused there is no material against the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner has not been put on T.I. Parade and the recovery of Rs. 3000 cannot be linked with the alleged loot.

6. Learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer of the bail of the petitioner by contending that petitioner is one of the gang members involved in such kind of loot and whenever they are short of money they commit similar crime.

7. In view of the fact that one person has been killed by the criminals while committing loot, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the prayer of bail of the petitioner is rejected herewith.

9. The District Judge, Samastipur and the Superintendent of Police, Samastipur are directed to see to it that the trial of the accused persons is not delayed.

10. If there is no sufficient progress in the trial then the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.

11. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the District Judge,



Samastipur and the Superintendent of Police, Samastipur through FAX and e-Mail for its compliance forthwith.”

3. A person was killed while the loot was being committed and the name of the petitioner has come in the self-inculpatory statement of the co-accused. A part of the looted amount has been recovered from the petitioner.

4. In view of the above, this application is again dismissed.”

4. In the trial, only two witnesses are left to be examined.

5. Considering the gravity of the offence and the fact that the trial is on the verge of conclusion, I am not inclined to review my earlier orders.

6. Accordingly, this application is dismissed again.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

sadique/-

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

