

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44326 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-392 Year-2025 Thana- KOCHADHAMAN District- Kishanganj

Munjir Alam @ Munajir Alam Son of Mahmuddin Resident of village -
Dighli, P.S. - Palasi, District - Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 20-07-2026 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 317(4) and
317(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of three cases and the informant
alleges that an accused was apprehended with stolen motorcycle
who disclosed his name as Naushad Alam and also disclosed
that he had purchased the motorcycle from petitioner and they
together commit theft of vehicle, further on verification e-
challan machine, the motorcycle was found stolen one,
accordingly the owner was contacted who disclosed that
motorcycle was stolen from Araria.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the



informant based on confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value, it is also submitted that motorcycle was recovered from Naushad Alam and based on his disclosure, the petitioner came to be implicated, it is further submitted that it is not the case of the prosecution that house of the petitioner was raided and any stolen articles/vehicles was recovered from his premises.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that Naushad Alam was apprehended with a stolen motorcycle and he disclosed that he had purchased the motorcycle from petitioner and they together commit theft of vehicle and petitioner has antecedent of three cases and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond.

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. This application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

