

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.87485 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-338 Year-2024 Thana- BEGUSARAI MUFFASIL District-
Begusarai

=====

Sujeet Kumar @ Sujit Kumar S/o Raj Kumar Mahto R/o Village -
Mahmadpur, Mahamadpur, P.S - Town, District - Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shubhesh Pandey, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Pushpa Sinha.1, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 13-02-2026 Heard Mr. Shubhesh Pandey, learned counsel
appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Pushpa Sinha.1,
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Begusarai Muffasil P.S. Case No. 338 of 2024 registered for the
offence(s) punishable under Sections 25(1-B)A, 26, 35 of the
Arms Act.

3. As per the allegation made in the FIR, one loaded
country made pistol was recovered from the possession of the
petitioner.

4. At the outset, learned counsel appearing on behalf
of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner's bail application



was rejected *vide* order dated 06.08.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No.28374 of 2025 by this Court. He further submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 09.09.2024, i.e. more than one year and he has ten criminal antecedents. Learned counsel referring to the order passed by the Apex Court in case of ***Md. Wazid Vs. State of UP & Ors.*** reported in ***2023 INSC 683*** , submitted that in the said case, the Apex Court has quashed the FIR of the said appellant despite having several previous criminal cases pending against the appellant.

5. *Per contra*, learned APP for the State vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of pre-arrest bail and submitted that in the case of ***Md. Wazid (Supra)*** the appellant of the said case was in custody for more than in the present case. He submitted that though the trial is at the initial stage, the petitioner don't deserve to be released on bail.

6. Having heard the rival submissions made on behalf of the parties, as well, having perused the allegation made in the FIR and also the fact that the petitioner has ten criminal antecedents, out of which, three are under Arms Act and he has remained in custody only for a period of more than one year, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, the present application stands



dismissed.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Ashishsingh/-

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

