

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72748 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-24 Year-2023 Thana- MOTIHARI MUFASIL District- East
Champaran

=====

Santosh Mahto @ Santosh Kumar Son of Ratan Mahto @ Ram Ratan Mahto
R/o Village- Sisawa, Ajagari, P.S.- Banjaria (Banjariya), District- East
Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms.Ranjana Srivastava, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Suman Kumari Singh, 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 Motihari Mufassil P.S. Case No. 24 of 2023 registered for the offence under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 23.04.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 21121 of 2025 which reads as under:-

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

*2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in
connection with Motihari Muffasil P.S. Case No.
24 of 2023 registered for the offence under
Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code.*

*3. As per the prosecution case, the
petitioners have looted motorcycle and mobile*



phone of the informant on gun point.

4. The name of the petitioner has come in the self-inculpatory statement of the co-accused and there are other materials also against the petitioner. The petitioner has criminal antecedent also.

5. The petitioner is in jail since 18.11.2024.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

8. If the trial of the petitioner is delayed due to the fault of the prosecution side then the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.

3. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the trial has started and charges have been framed.

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	
---	--	---	--

