

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35355 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-191 Year-2025 Thana- Madhusudanpur District- Bhagalpur

=====

Anant Kumar @ Anta Mandal @ Annu @ Anandi Kumar S/o Niraj Kumar @
Niraj Mandal Resident of Village- Purani Sarai, P.S.- Nathnagar, District-
Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajive Ranjan Singh, Advocate.

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

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

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

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection
with Madhusudanpur P.S. Case No. 191 of 2025 registered for
the offence punishable under Section 309(6) of the B.N.S.,
2023.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that three
unknown miscreants have snatched the mobile, ATM cards, Rs.
7,000/-, blank cheque of the informant, also assaulted him, and
also asked the password of the mobile from the informant.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has
committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this



case. He also submits that the FIR was lodged against unknown miscreants. The name of this petitioner has surfaced in this case on the basis of the statement of the spy. Learned counsel submits that though in this case, Test Identification Parade (TIP) was conducted and in the TIP, the petitioner was identified by the informant but from a perusal of the FIR itself, it is clear that the informant himself has stated that due to darkness, he could not identify the miscreants. Learned counsel further submits that at one place the informant says that he could not identify the miscreants, and on what basis he has identified the petitioner in the TIP is not clear, and it creates doubt on the TIP itself. He further submits that nothing has been recovered from the possession of this petitioner. It is alleged that on the statement of this petitioner, the mobile was recovered from the possession of one Sahul Kumar. Moreover, the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 09.01.2026.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State and submits that the petitioner is having criminal antecedent of seven cases.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage,



however, he may renew his prayer for bail after the examination of the informant.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

