

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49888 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-294 Year-2026 Thana- KADAMKUAN District- Patna

Amritam Pandey S/O Late Vinay Pandey R/O Vill.- Bihari Sao Lane, P.s.-
Pirbahore, Dist.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Brij Bihari Tiwary

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 03-08-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Section 304(2) of the BNS.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that three unknown accused came on a motorcycle and the accused sitting in the middle snatched his chain and all accused fled through Khetan Market.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR is against unknown, it is reiterated and submitted that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent, it is next submitted that his name transpired during the course of investigation based on



identification by Nakul who is his agnate and is having dispute relating to property.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the order impugned, it would manifest that the same records that Nakul identified three accused persons based on CCTV footage, it is next submitted that based on CCTV footage the registration number of the motorcycle was recovered and Nakul identified the owner of the motorcycle as Aman who was driving the vehicle and petitioner was sitting behind and Amit was in the middle who committed the occurrence, it is also submitted that though it is being submitted that Nakul with an intent to falsely implicate the petitioner implicated him in the instant case being an agnate but then the said ground is not pleaded in the anticipatory bail application. Learned A.P.P. further submits that had the petitioner not participated in the occurrence or would not have been present at the place of occurrence when the occurrence took place in that event a plea in the anticipatory bail application would have been taken that petitioner was not even present at the place of occurrence and was not seen in the CCTV footage, it is next submitted that investigation in the case is



continuing.

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

7. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikram/-

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

