

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72132 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-378 Year-2024 Thana- HARSIDHI District- East Champaran

Vivek Kumar S/o- Amar Prasad Soni @ Amar Prasad Resident of village-
Ram Nagar Ward No- 02 PS-Ram Nagar Distt- West Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajeev Ranjan No. Ii, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 11-02-2026 Heard the parties.

2. This is the second attempt of the petitioner for grant of regular bail in connection S.Tr. No. 501/2025 arising out of Harsiddhi P.S. Case No. 378 of 2024 registered for the offence under Section 310(2) of the B.N.S. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 19.02.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 9505 of 2025 which reads as under:-

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

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Harsidhi P.S. Case No. 378 of 2024 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 310(2) of the BNS.

3. As per the prosecution case, unknown criminals looted Rs. 7,98,000/- from the branch of finance company on gun point.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits



that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. The name of the petitioner has surfaced in the self-inculpatory statement of the co-accused from whom the recovery has been made. The petitioner is in jail since 19.10.2024.

5. Learned APP appearing for the State opposes the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present bail application stands dismissed.

3. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the court below has reported that it will fix a date twice a week for taking the evidence.

4. Considering the aforesaid facts, this Court finds no ground to review its earlier order.

5. Accordingly, this application is dismissed again.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

tusharika/-

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

