

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.85321 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-110 Year-2025 Thana- DHAMOUL District- Nawada

Ritesh Kumar @ Ritesh Satya @ Ritesh Kumar Satya, S/O Bhagirath Yadav,  
Resident of Village - Rehadi, P.S- Damoul, Dist- Nawada

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amit Ranjan, Advocate  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Parmanand Kumar, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      06-01-2026                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
A.P.P. for the State.

2. Petitioner, who is in custody, seeks bail in connection with Damoul P.S. Case No. 110 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 310(4), 310(5), 111(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 25(1-b)a, 26, 35 of the Arms Act, 1959.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant has stated that during his patrolling duty he received some information that some miscreants were planning to commit a loot. The police intercepted few persons among whom three persons were apprehended, who disclosed their names as Deepak Kumar, Ritesh Kumar @ Ritesh Kumar Satya (petitioner), Pradeep Kumar and Rahul Kumar and they further



disclosed that one Suddu Chaudhary managed to escape. On search a Redmi mobile, a motorcycle and a country made pistol loaded with live cartridges were recovered from the possession of co-accused Deepak Kumar, while a phone was recovered from the petitioner Ritesh Kumar.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. No incriminating article or arms have been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. The only recovery said to have been made from the petitioner is a mobile phone, which has been owned by the petitioner. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedent and is in custody since 15.08.2025.

5. The learned A.P.P. has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions made by the parties, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Damoul P.S. Case No. 110 of 2025, subject to the following conditions:-



(i) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his close relative and the other shall be local resident.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present in Court on each date of the trial.

(iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the court concerned.

(iv) If the petitioner is found involved in similar nature of offence in future, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of his bail bond.

(v) The learned 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 antecedent, 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.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail is allowed.

8. It is made clear that the observation, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

**(Sourendra Pandey, J)**

manoj/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

