IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.75742 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC011054942026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-201 Year-2026 Thana- MANIGACHI District- Darbhanga

==========

Suraj Kumar Yadav @ Suraj Kumar S/o Ramdayal Yadav @ Munna Yadav Resident of Village- Chakraje, PS- Manigachhi, Distt.- Darbhanga

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Tushar Anand, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Prem Kumar Jha, A.P.P.

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GIRIJISH KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

2 28-10-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Manigachhi P.S. Case No. 201 of 2026 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 309(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. As per the prosecution case, on 24.07.2026 at about 9:00 P.M., informant Baijnath Sahu, after closing his fruit shop near Manigachhi Railway Station Chowk, was returning to his residence at Raje Lilababu Tole on a bicycle. Near St. Mary International School, a red-coloured car was allegedly parked, and 3-4 persons alighted from it and assaulted the informant with fists and slaps, one of them threatened him. The persons

WEB COPY

allegedly snatched his Infinix mobile phone, purse containing Rs. 3,000/-, Aadhaar Card, torch and bicycle, and fled in the car. The informant noted the vehicle registration as BR01PM0566. The FIR was registered against unknown persons on 25.07.2026. The vehicle was allegedly captured in nearby CCTV footage.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are general and omnibus in nature and that no incriminating article has been recovered from his possession. Referring to paragraph 8 of the case diary, learned counsel submits that the mobile phone snatched from the informant was recovered from co-accused Raushan Kumar Yadav and not from the petitioner. The petitioner has clean antecedents and has been in custody since 25.07.2026. Therefore, the petitioner deserves the privilege of regular bail.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the vehicle in question belongs to the petitioner. It is further submitted that the petitioner, along with the other co-accused persons, is alleged to have snatched the informant's mobile phone and purse

WEB COPY

containing Rs. 3,000/-. Therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of regular bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the materials available on record. Considering the fact that the petitioner was not apprehended at the spot and was arrested only on the basis of the fact that the vehicle in question is registered in his name, no incriminating article has been recovered from his possession, and he has been in custody since 25.07.2026, this Court is of the view that the petitioner deserves the privilege of regular bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail is allowed.

8. Let the petitioner above-named be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned A.C.J.M.-6, Darbhanga/ concerned court in connection with Manigachhi P.S. Case No. 201 of 2026, subject to the following conditions:

(i) Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court and shall remain physically present as directed by the Court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, their bail bond shall be canceled by the Court below.

WEB COPY

(ii) If the petitioner tamper with the evidence or the witness, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(iii) And, further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedents, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Girijish Kumar, J)

Siwani/-

U		T	

WEB COPY