

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44407 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-514 Year-2020 Thana- SAHEBGANJ District- Muzaffarpur

Sandeep Kumar @ Sandeep S/o Umesh Sah R/o Village- Halimpur, P.O-
Rajwara, P.S- Sahebganj, Dist- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sagar Kumar, Adv.

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 21-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 399, 402,
413 and 414 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 25(1-B)(a),
26 and 35 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that secret information was received that miscreants
were planning to commit offence of *dacoity*, accordingly the
place of occurrence was raided on 01.10.2020 at 6:20 PM and
five accused were arrested and others succeeded in fleeing
away, further arms and cartridges were recovered from Sachin
and Md. Ashik and the stolen motorcycle was recovered from



Md. Asgar and the apprehended accused disclosed their name as well as name of the petitioners who fled.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is further submitted that petitioner was not apprehended from the place of occurrence and his name transpired in the confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and submits that the case is of the year 2020 and petitioner is named in the FIR though his name transpired based on disclosure made by the apprehended accused at the place of occurrence from where arms and cartridges along with stolen motorcycle was recovered. It is next submitted that the petitioner in the instant anticipatory bail application has not disclosed what he does for earning a living. It is further submitted that case is of the year 2020 and the anticipatory bail application has been filed in 2026 and investigation in the case against the petitioner is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



7. Accordingly, the instant application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

rajesh/-

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

