

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49664 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-52 Year-2026 Thana- Bhopatpur District- East Champaran

Sanoj Sahani @ Rambharosh Sahani S/o Nandlal Sahani R/o Village -
Bhopatpur, P.S. - Bhopatpur, Dist. - East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Amit Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shaheen Begum

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. B. PD. SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 22-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The instant application for anticipatory bail has been filed by the petitioner apprehending his arrest in connection with Bhopatpur P.S. Case No;- 52 of 2026 instituted for the offences under Section 309(4) of the BNS.

3. As per the prosecution case, it is alleged that, in the evening, while the informant was returning home after collecting Rs. 14,000/- from a medical store and purchasing chicken from a nearby shop, he was intercepted by six unknown persons riding on two motorcycles. The accused persons allegedly wrongfully restrained him, gagged his mouth, and robbed him of his mobile phone before fleeing from the place of occurrence.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. It is further submitted that the allegations levelled against the petitioner is false, frivolous, baseless, and concocted, and that he has been falsely implicated in the present case due to village politics. It is contended that there is no specific allegations against the petitioner, rather the allegations are general and omnibus in nature against all the accused persons. It is further submitted that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and that his name surfaced only in the confessional statement of the co-accused, Rahul Kumar.

5. Learned APP appearing on behalf of the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that there are specific allegations against the petitioner. Upon perusal of the FIR and paragraph 23 of the case diary, it appears that during the raid conducted at the house of the petitioner, namely, Sanoj Sahani @ Rambharosh Sahani, the police recovered a looted mobile phone bearing IMEI numbers matching those of the mobile phone mentioned in the written report lodged by the informant. It is further submitted that the investigation is still in progress.

6. Considering the fact that the robbed mobile phone

of the informant was recovered from the house of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(S. B. Pd. Singh, J)

Ayush/-

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