

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.62439 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-455 Year-2023 Thana- BAHERA District- Darbhanga

Sumit Kumar @ Bigan S/O Arun Bhagat R/O Vill.- Simri, P.s.-
Vidyapatnagar, District- Samstipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sabal Kumar Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bharat Bhushan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 26-02-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned APP for the State.

2. This is the 2nd attempt of the petitioner. The
petitioner seeks bail in connection with Bahera P.S. Case No.
455 of 2023, registered for the offence under Sections 395 and
412 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner was
rejected on 28.08.2024 in Cr. Misc. No. 58737 of 2024 which
reads as follows:-

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

*2. The petitioner seeks regular bail
in connection with Bahera P.S. Case No. 455
of 2023 registered for the offence under
Section 395 of the Indian Penal Code.*

*3. As per the prosecution case, in
the shop of the informant, dacoity was*



committed. Criminals looted Rs. 25,000/- and thereafter they also took away ornaments, domestic utensils, laptop worth Rs. 10,00,000/- and mobiles.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no recovery from the possession of the petitioner and is in custody since 01.01.2024. He further submits that the name of the petitioner has surfaced in the confessional statement of co-accused Ankesh Kumar @ Mikal.

5. Learned A.P.P. has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that the petitioner has three criminal antecedents.

6. I have considered the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner. The name of the petitioner has surfaced in the self inculpatory statement of co-accused and some looted articles have been recovered from the house of the petitioner.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. This application for regular bail is accordingly rejected.”

4. The trial of the petitioner is going on and also considering the gravity of offence, this Court finds no ground to review its earlier order. Accordingly, this application for regular bail stands rejected.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Ranjeet/-

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

