IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67110 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010967982026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-44 Year-2026 Thana- AMBA District- Aurangabad

==========

Sujit Kumar @ Sujit Kumar Yadav @ Guddu Yadav S/o Prabhu Yadav R/o Village - Ajaniya Tola, Yadav Bigha, P.S. - Simra, Dist. - Aurangabad.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar ... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Mukul Kumari, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Upendra Kumar, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA

ORAL ORDER

3 19-11-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offence punishable under Section 309(6) of the BNS.

3. As per the prosecution case, on 14.03.2026, three unknown miscreants snatched a motorcycle, mobile phone, wallet containing Rs. 700/- cash, Aadhar Card, PAN Card and other documents as well as golden locket from informant's neck.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the First Information Report was lodged against unknown miscreants and the name of the petitioner transpired subsequently during the course of investigation in the confessional statement of co-accused Gautam Kumar, It has also been submitted that no recovery was made from the possession of the petitioner and he was also not put on TIP. Further, the petitioner is in custody since 08.07.2026 and

WEB COPY

charge-sheet has been submitted. The petitioner also undertakes to cooperate in the trial.

5. Learned APP for the State opposed the bail petition on the ground that besides the fact that his name has been disclosed during the course of investigation as one of the miscreants, he is also a history-sheeter with 16 criminal antecedents as disclosed in paragraph 3 of the bail petition.

6. In response, it has been submitted that many of the cases are under the Excise Act and the petitioner is on bail in all the cases.

7. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the period of custody along with the petitioner's involvement in other criminal cases including those under Section 392 of the IPC etc., I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the bail application is rejected.

8. However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

priyanka/-

U		T	

WEB COPY