

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.85543 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-970 Year-2025 Thana- GAYA MUFASIL District- Gaya

=====

Satish Singh @ Satish Kumar, S/o Babu Ram Singh, R/o Vill. - Hario, P.S. -
Magadh Medical, Distt. - Gaya ji.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Birendra Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Raj Ballabh Singh, Addl. P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 08-01-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the

learned Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner, who is in custody, seeks bail in
connection with Muffasil (Gaya) P.S. Case No. 970 of 2025
registered for the offence(s) punishable under Section(s) 310(2)
and 317(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (B.N.S.) and
Section(s) 25(1-b)a, 26 and 35 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant has
stated that he had taken a loan of Rs. 4,24,000/- from his
relatives in order to double the money. He was waiting at a
certain point where a *Scorpio* car approached him and around
six people snatched away the said amount from him and they try



to flee. However, the police reached there and apprehended two persons, namely, Satish Singh (the petitioner) and Dayanand Kumar Bharti. The police thereafter recovered the looted amount alongwith two loaded country made pistols, extra registration plates and mobile phones from their possession.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case and he is no where connected with the said offence. It has next been submitted that the petitioner was merely a passer-by and the police, on suspicion, has arrested him. However, the petitioner has no concern with the other co-accused person, namely, Dayanand Kumar Bharti. It has further been submitted that the petitioner is pursuing his *Diploma* in Mechanical Engineering from Chandigarh and that he has no concern with the aforesaid snatching of the amount and the same has also not been recovered from his conscious possession as shown by the police. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further drawn the attention of this Court towards two seizure-list, which would suffice that at 2:20 P.M., the one of the seizure-list, *i.e.*, the recovery from the *Scorpio* car has been shown while the other seizure-list of recovery of a motorcycle, which belongs to the sister of the petitioner, is said to have been recovered at 7:40



P.M. from some other place, which creates doubt in the prosecution story. It has been submitted that the petitioner is neither the owner of the *Scorpio* car nor the driver of the same and hence, he has falsely been implicated in this case. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioner carries no criminal antecedent and he is in custody since 20.09.2025.

5. The learned Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail.

6. Regard being had to the facts and circumstances of the case and taking note of the fact that the petitioner has remained in custody since 20.09.2025, let the petitioner, above-named, be released on bail on his 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 Muffasil (Gaya) P.S. Case No. 970 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 a local resident.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present before the concerned Court on each and every date of the trial and shall cooperate in the investigation.

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



Court.

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

(v) The concerned Court shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case, at any stage, it is found that he has concealed his criminal antecedent, the Court concerned shall take necessary steps for cancellation of his bail bond. However, the acceptance of bail bond in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

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

8. The application stands allowed.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Praveen-II/-

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

