

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.61500 of 2025

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

=====

Sooraj Singh @ Suraj Singh S/o Ajay Singh Resident of Parsurampur, P.S-
Sinha, Distt.- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

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

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

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

- 5 30-01-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Rabindra Kumar.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for
the offences punishable under Sections 310(2) and 111(2) of the
BNS, 2023.
3. The SHO-cum-Investigating Officer of the case,
in compliance of the order dated 09.01.2026, is present in the
Court.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has antecedent of two cases and allegation is of committing loot in Tanishq showroom at Ara.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence nor he was involved in the occurrence rather his name transpired in the confessional statement of co-accused Amit, but then Amit though has taken name of Suraj Kumar, but then the said Suraj Kumar is different from the present petitioner, as present petitioner is son of Ajay Singh while Suraj Kumar whose name was disclosed by Amit is son of Nirmal Singh. It is also submitted that in the CCTV footage also the petitioner is not seen in the occurrence. It is next submitted that petitioner is in custody since 21.03.2025.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the bail application.

7. The SHO-cum-Investigating Officer of the case, who is present in the Court, submits that during the course of investigation the involvement of the petitioner transpired and it also came to light that petitioner was involved in sheltering accused in his house and was also in contact with the kingpin which transpired from the CDR investigation. The SHO submits that it is a serious offence of committing loot in a gold



showroom and petitioner also has antecedents.

8. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

9. **Accordingly, the instant bail application stands rejected.**

10. The personal appearance of the SHO-cum-Investigating Officer of the case is dispensed with.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

