

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.61401 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-113 Year-2025 Thana- FORBESGANJ District- Araria

Mehnuddin @ Mahinoddin S/o Md. Akhtar R/o Village - Madarganj, P.S -  
Farbisganj (Simraha O.P), District - Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                                                                                       |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Bishwajeet Singh, Advocate<br>Mr. Kundan Kumar Singh, Advocate<br>Mr. Ram Krishna Yadav, advocate |
| For the State.       | : | Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, A.P.P.                                                                    |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

5      20-02-2026                      Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned  
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail, arises out of Forbisganj Police Station Case No. 113 of 2025, disclosing offences under Section 310(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. The Prosecution Case, as per the First Information Report, is that on 28.02.2025 at about 7:15 P.M., while the informant was at his grocery shop and was reconciling the day's sale proceeds with his brother, approximately 10-12 armed miscreants entered the shop and at pistol point, looted a sum of about Rs. 16,00,000/- (Rupees sixteen lakhs). The miscreants also took away the informant's Aadhaar Card, PAN Card,



Driving Licence, Arms Licence, and mobile phone along with the SIM card. It is further alleged that thereafter the said miscreants entered into another shop, namely *Gautam Bhandar* and looted a sum of Rs. 6,00,000/- (Rupees six lakhs)

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case only on the basis of the alleged confessional statement of a co-accused who has already been arrested with whom the petitioner was having inimical terms. The petitioner and the father of the co-accused, Md. Ashique, are known to each other as both are engaged in the cattle business, and on account of a business dispute, the co-accused Md. Ashique has maliciously taken the name of the petitioner in the present case. A Co-ordinate Bench of this Hon'ble Court has called for the CCTV footage in connection with the present case. Learned counsel draws attention to paragraph 43 of the case diary, wherein identification of the accused persons on the basis of CCTV footage has been mentioned; however, the name of the present petitioner does not appear.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State submits that during the course of investigation, it has come to light that the petitioner is associated with a gang operating in the



area and is involved in the commission of serious offences of dacoity, including looting of shops. Some non-FIR accused persons, namely Prince Kumar, Saurav Kumar, Monu Sharma and Manoj Kumar, were taken into custody during investigation. Another accused, Ranjan Yadav, was taken into custody on remand in connection with Narpatganj P.S. Case No. 77 of 2025. The said Ranjan Yadav was initially arrested in Shimraha P.S. Case No. 64 of 2025. Learned counsel for the State further submits that accused Md. Ashiq was arrested by Raniganj Police Station and another accused, Md. Kadir, was also remanded in the present case. During the course of investigation, the case has been found true against the aforesaid non-FIR named accused persons, and accordingly charge-sheet has been submitted against them, excluding the present petitioner. The investigation is still going on against the petitioner and one Manish Kumar.

**6.** Regards being had to the submissions made by the parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegation and the gravity of the offence and the fact that the statement of the co-accused, may form the basis for further investigation against the present petitioner. Since this Court is not conducting mini trial at this stage, the CCTV footage produced in a sealed cover is not being opened and the same is returned to the Investigating



Authority for the purpose of further investigation against the petitioner and other accused persons, accordingly, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of anticipatory bail.

7. In the result, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

**(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)**

Siwani/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

