

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40608 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-432 Year-2022 Thana- MADHAURAH District- Saran

1. Amrit Pandey Son of Umesh Pandey Resident of Vill- Near Dam, Hathsarganj, P.S.-Hajipur, Dist- Vaishali
2. Sanni Prasad Son of Umesh Pandey Resident of village- Ward no. 13, Jamalpur Colony, near School Bishunapur Basnat @ Shubhai, Bishunpur Basant, Ps- Hajipur, Dist- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sitesh Kashyap, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Rabindra Kumar.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 382 of the BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits petitioners are person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on 04.07.2022 he withdrew an amount Rs. 50,000/- from bank account jointly held by him and his wife, it is further alleged that out of Rs. 50,000/- before withdrawn an amount of Rs. 40,000/- was credited in the account in the name of his wife by way of first installment of Prime Minister Awas Yojana, the



informant after withdrawing the amount kept the money in a plastic bag, it next alleged that when the informant came out of the bank he saw three suspicious accused who also came out of the bank, further when he reached Chapra Marhaura main road two accused came on bike and snatched the plastic bag containing money and fled away.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the FIR was against unknown and the name of the petitioner transpired based on confessional statement of Suraj in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value, it is also submitted that Suraj was arrested and was granted the privilege of a regular bail by the learned District Court.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioners and submits that the FIR was against unknown and police during the course of investigation arrested Suraj and based on his confession the name of the petitioners transpired, it is also submitted that informant is a poor person who had withdrawn an amount of Rs. 50,000/- for construction of his house, but the same was snatched, it is next submitted that informant also alleges that he saw three accused coming out of the bank and if TIP of the petitioners is conducted the informant may identify the accused,



it is also submitted that even the anticipatory bail application does not disclose that as to what petitioners do to earn their living.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and the Court is in agreement with the submission made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, as such, this Court is not inclined to grant of privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. This application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

