

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.79188 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-137 Year-2023 Thana- TARABARI District- Araria

=====

Amar Manjhi @ Amar Kumar Manjhi @ Amar Kumar Manjhi S/O
Visheshwar Manjhi R/o Village- Baturwari (Pategana) P.S.- Tarabari,
District-Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Madhav Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Uday Chand Prasad

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-01-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in Tarabari P. S. Case No.137 of 2023 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 457 and 380 of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has antecedent of one case but inadvertently at
Para-3, it has been recorded that petitioner is a person with clean
antecedent and the informant alleges that in his absence, a theft
took place in his house and accused committed theft of articles
worth Rs.7 Lacs.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



the FIR was against against known and the name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody, which does not have any evidentiary value. It is also submitted that petitioner works in Delhi and was not even present at the place of occurrence on the date of occurrence.

5. Learned A.P.P. vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that though in the anticipatory bail application, it is pleaded that petitioner works in Delhi, but then, it is a bald statement, no address where the petitioner resides is given, nor the kind of work, the petitioner is discharging at Delhi is pleaded. It is next submitted that it is a case of looting the house in absence of the informant and the investigation of the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

