

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47624 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-171 Year-2025 Thana- ARA NAGAR District- Bhojpur

Abhishek Kumar S/o Sri Gajender Prasad Jaiswal R/o Village- Mahua Singh Sarai, P.S.- Mahua, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 54135 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-171 Year-2025 Thana- ARA NAGAR District- Bhojpur

Nitin Kumar @ Nitin Pandey Son of Amrendra Kumar Pandey RO Village- Sanchipatti Harauli PS -Sadar Hajipur District -Vaishali Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 58071 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-171 Year-2025 Thana- ARA NAGAR District- Bhojpur

Gaurav Kumar @ Rishu Raj Son of Late Sanjay Kumar Singh Resident of village - Kalyanpur, P.S.- Sarai, District - Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 65672 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-171 Year-2025 Thana- ARA NAGAR District- Bhojpur

Gautam Kumar S/o Vinod Kumar Chaudhary @ Vinod Choudhary R/o Village- Majhauri, P.S.- Vidupur, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar



... .. Opposite Party/s

with
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 75454 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-171 Year-2025 Thana- ARA NAGAR District- Bhojpur

Gautam Kumar Son of Shiv Chandra Chaudhary @ shiv Kumar Chaudhary
Resident of Village -Majhauri Bidpur PS -Bidpur District -Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 47624 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Thakur, Advocate
Ms.Vaishnavi Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jagdhar Prasad, APP
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 54135 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anirudh Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anil Kumar, APP
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 58071 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shivanand Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Narendra Kumar Singh, APP
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 65672 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shivanand Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Fahimuddin, APP
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 75454 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shivanand Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Sharma, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 24-02-2026 **Criminal Miscellaneous No.47624 of 2025**

Heard Mr. Ajay Kumar Thakur, learned counsel for
the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 310(2) and 111(2) of B.N.S.,
2023 as well as under Sections 25(1-b)a, 26 and 35 of the Arms
Act.



3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 30.03.2025 and has antecedent of one case under the Excise Act.

4. At this stage, learned APP for the State submits that it is the case of committing loot in a gold show-room and during the course of investigation, it transpired that petitioner had purchased the looted gold article and had also melted the same and gold biscuits were also seized from his house.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the said submission of the learned APP but then submits that whether petitioner purchased the looted gold article or not is to be tested in the trial and allegations are in realm of allegations.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner is hereby rejected in connection with Ara Town P.S. Case No.171 of 2025, pending in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bhojpur, Ara.

Criminal Miscellaneous No.54135 of 2025

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the



offences punishable under Sections 310(2) and 111(2) of B.N.S., 2023.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 31.03.2025 and has antecedents of three cases but then all the three cases against the petitioner were dropped.

4. At this stage, learned APP for the State submits that it is the case relating to committing loot in a gold show-room. It is further submitted that petitioner is not named in the FIR and during the course of investigation, based on confessional statement of apprehended accused, the name of the petitioner transpired. It is also submitted that off late loot in the State of Bihar has become rampant and if privilege of bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the said submissions of the learned APP but then submits that name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value and, whether petitioner was involved in the occurrence or not, that is subject matter of trial.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the



Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner is hereby rejected in connection with Town (Ara) P.S. Case No.171 of 2025, pending in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ara.

Criminal Miscellaneous No.58071 of 2025

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 310(2) and 111(2) of B.N.S., 2023.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody since 30.03.2025.

4. At this stage, learned APP for the State submits that the offence alleged in the FIR is serious as the same relates to committing of loot in a gold shop. It is further submitted that though FIR is against unknown but then name of the petitioner transpired during the course of investigation in the confessional statement of apprehended accused and even the car registered in the name of the petitioner was also found to be involved in the occurrence.



5. Learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the said submissions of the learned APP but then submits that confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody does not have any evidentiary value. It is also submitted that no doubt the car of the petitioner has been seized with an allegation that the same was involved in the occurrence but then the car was purchased on loan and the same was taken by Manish Rai, whose involvement transpired during the course of investigation, hence petitioner came to be implicated subsequently.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to released the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner is hereby rejected in connection with Ara Town P.S. Case No.171 of 2025, pending in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ara.

Criminal Miscellaneous No.65672 of 2025

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 310(2) and 111(2) of B.N.S., 2023.



3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that at the time of filing of the instant bail application, the petitioner was a person with clean antecedent but subsequently the petitioner came to be implicated in one case, as such, the petitioner has antecedent of one case and is in custody since 15.03.2025.

4. At this stage, learned APP for the State submits that allegations are serious as the case is of committing loot in a gold show-room. It is further submitted that no doubt FIR was against unknown but then during the course of investigation, the name of the petitioner also transpired. It is next submitted that petitioner before the police confessed that he was waiting with his car at Vaishali for the accused persons to come after committing the occurrence. It is also submitted that charges have been framed and trial has commenced on which the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no doubt trial has commenced and 5-6 witnesses have been examined but still more than 18 witnesses are yet to be examined.

5. Since trial has commenced and witnesses are being examined, as such, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner is hereby rejected in connection with Ara Town P.S.



Case No.171 of 2025, pending in the court of learned Chief
Judicial Magistrate, Ara.

Criminal Miscellaneous No.75454 of 2025

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 310(2) and 111(2) of B.N.S.,
2023.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 15.06.2025
and at the time of filing of the instant bail application, the
petitioner was a person with clean antecedent but subsequently
the petitioner came to be implicated in one case, as such, the
petitioner has antecedent of one case.

4. At this stage, learned APP for the State submits that
allegations are serious as the case is with respect to committing
loot in a gold show-room. It is further submitted that no doubt
FIR was against unknown but then name of the petitioner
transpired in the confessional statement of apprehended
accused, namely, Gautam Kumar. It is further submitted that
name of the instant petitioner is identical to the name of
petitioner of Criminal Miscellaneous No.65672 of 2025



(Gautam Kumar). It is also submitted that regular bail application of Gautam Kumar was rejected by an order dated 24.02.2026 in Criminal Miscellaneous No.65672 of 2025.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner does not dispute the said submissions but then the difference between the case of this petitioner and petitioner of Criminal Miscellaneous No.65672 of 2025 is that in the case of petitioner, the charges till date has not been framed on which the learned APP submits that if charges are framed and the petitioner is released on bail, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner is hereby rejected in connection with Ara Town P.S. Case No.171 of 2025, pending in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ara.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sanjay/-

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

