

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42229 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-133 Year-2026 Thana- KANKARBAG District- Patna

=====

Kunal Singh @ Kunal S/o Balendra Prasad Singh @ Balendra Prasad R/O
vill- Ward No-01,Hemanpur, Shivai singhpur P.S- Mohiuddin Nagar, Dist-
Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Jagdhar Prasad, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Awadhesh Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 01-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P
for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. Learned counsel for the informant submits that he has filed soft copy as well as hard copy of the *vakalatnama*, but his name is not reflecting in the cause list. In support thereof, he has produced the photo copy of the receipt of filing the *vakalatnama*, which is hereby accepted in the court.

3. The petitioner is apprehending arrest in connection with Kankarbagh P.S. Case No. 133 of 2026 lodged on 16.02.2026, for the offence punishable under Section 305 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, pending in the Court of A.C.J.M-II, Patna.



4. As per the prosecution, FIR has been lodged against the sole petitioner. It has been alleged by the informant that the petitioner entered the office premises on a holiday, switched off the CCTV camera, took the cash from the office, and thereafter, fled away from the premises.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He submits that in the FIR, a vague allegation has been made against the petitioner. As per the allegation, the only thing transpires is that the petitioner turned off the CCTV camera, but what amount was subject to theft, has not been described in the FIR. Counsel further submits that the petitioner has clean antecedent and he is ready to fulfill all the conditions whatsoever shall be imposed upon him.

6. Learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that as per the rejection order passed by the Sessions Court, it become crystal clear that theft of Rs. 3,00,000/- (Rupees Three Lacs) in cash and misappropriation of Rs. 10,20,190/- (Rupees Ten Lacs Twenty Thousand One Hundred Ninety) has come during investigation.

7. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the Sessions Court at the



time of passing order on the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner has perused the case diary and materials of the case diary has also been jotted down.

8. As such, in the present facts and circumstances considering that in the case diary, specific material has come against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

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

