

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49707 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-70 Year-2025 Thana- LAUHIYANAGAR District- Begusarai

Agam Kumar @ Agama Kumar S/o Bishnu Dev Ray R/o Village - Jagdishpur
Ramanand Nagar, Kushmaut, P.S. - Muffasil, Dist. - Begusarai(Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Deepak Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Raj Ballabh Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

- 2 28-07-2026 **1.** Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.
- 2.** The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Lohiya Nagar PS Case No. 70 of 2025, registered for the offences
punishable under Section 309(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
- 3.** Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges
that three unknown accused intercepted him and looted Rs.
5,25,592/- along with other articles as detailed in the FIR and the
accused were in age group of 35-40 years.
- 4.** Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR was
against unknown and the name of the petitioner transpired during the
course of investigation based on confessional statement of
apprehended accused in police custody, it is further submitted that
confessional statement in police custody does not have any
evidentiary value.



5. On query of the court from the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that what does the petitioner do for his living, on which the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a labour and works in a company at Delhi, as such the Court made further query that where the petitioner in Delhi resides and in which company he works, on which the learned counsel submits that he does not have any information in this regard nor any pleading to that effect is made in the anticipatory bail application that petitioner is a labour and works in Delhi.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the case is of road robbery and the investigation of the case is continuing.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

