

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44239 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-419 Year-2025 Thana- GOPALPUR District- Patna

=====

Bablu Kumar @ Maidam Son of Jathu Yadav @ Jethu Yadav Resident of
Village- Ambatari, P.S.- Chauparan, District- Hazaribagh, Jharkhand, At
present Resident of Village- Ambatari, P.S.- Gurpa, District- Gayaji, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anmol Kumar, Advocate

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

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 16-07-2026 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 Section 305(b) of
the BNS, 2023.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of four cases and the informant alleges
that on 26.09.2025, he had gone to a house near Rocky
Mukhiya's pond to carry out plumbing work, but when he
returned, he saw his motorcycle missing.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
FIR was instituted against unknown and the name of the
petitioner transpired during the course of investigation based on



the fact that stolen motorcycle was recovered from Gurpa police station and the motorcycle was being used by the petitioner by affixing a different number plate. It is further submitted that petitioner has no concern with the stolen motorcycle.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and submits that petitioner has antecedent of four cases and the stolen motorcycle has been recovered, as recorded in the order impugned and the I.O. has recorded that it was petitioner who was using the motorcycle. The learned APP next submits that investigation in the case is also continuing and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence.

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

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

