

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.77689 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-171 Year-2024 Thana- MAHUA District- Vaishali

=====

Rohit Kumar @ Rohit Ray @ Kallu S/O Rajeev Ray @ Rajeev Ranjan
Resident of Village- Bhadwas Ward No. 03, P.S.- Mahua, Distt.- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shanti Bhushan Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nand Kishore Prasad, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 03-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Mahua
P.S. Case No. 171 of 2024 instituted for the offence under
Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that on
03.04.2024 at about 6:45 P.M., while the informant was
returning home after closing his Aadarsh Electronics shop at
Panchmukhi Chowk, Mahua, he was intercepted near Kariyo
Chaur bridge by three persons riding an Apache motorcycle.
One accused kicked his motorcycle, snatched Rs. 20,000/- and
his mobile phone at gunpoint, and another fled away with the
informant's motorcycle towards Kariyo village, whereafter the



police were informed.

4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 13.08.2025. Petitioner bears eight (8) criminal antecedents, as per disclosure made in paragraph No. 3 of the bail application.

5. It has been further submitted by the petitioner's counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Petitioner is not named in the FIR. Name of the petitioner has transpired on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused, namely, Sanoj Kumar, and the same has no evidentiary value in the eye of law. Petitioner was not even put on T.I. Parade to ascertain his complicity in the alleged occurrence. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Charge sheet has already been submitted in this case.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. It is submitted that petitioner has confessed his guilt in his confessional statement.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, period of custody of the petitioner and charge sheet being submitted, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the



petitioner.

8. Let the petitioner be released on bail, *after framing of charge, if not already framed*, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 15,000/- (Fifteen Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Court below/concerned Court in connection with Mahua P.S. Case No. 171 of 2024 , subject to the following conditions:

(I) One of the bailors shall be own/close member of the family of the petitioner.

(II) The petitioner shall appear on each and every date fixed at the trial. In case of default in such appearance on two consecutive dates, the Trial Court will have liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

