

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.88144 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-89 Year-2006 Thana- CHIRAIYA District- East Champaran

Ramchela Ray S/o Ramchandra Rai @ Jaga Ray R/o Village - Tikuliya, P.S -
Muffasil, District - East Champaran (Wrongly -Katihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Lalan Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 12-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Chiraiya P.S. Case No. 89 of 2006 registered for the offences punishable under Section 395 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant, working as a *munshi* at a brick kiln, had kept ₹6,000/-, being the sale proceeds of 3,000 bricks, in a box. At about 11:15 P.M., while he and other workers were sleeping, 8-9 miscreants arrived at the brick kiln, out of whom four entered the room, committed robbery of the said amount, threatened to kill them, and fled from the spot.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged in the F.I.R. It is further submitted that petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. rather his name has surfaced upon the confessional statement of co-accused Dhuman Rai. No incriminating article has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. Apart from that, petitioner having five criminal antecedents in which he is on bail. Petitioner has been in custody since 21.09.2025.

5. The learned A.P.P. for the State opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the impugned order, it is evident that charge-sheet has been submitted against the petitioner along with co-accused persons on 16.02.2008 showing them absconder. Apart from that petitioner is having five criminal antecedents. Hence, he does not deserve bail.

6. From perusal of the record, it appears that the present case is of the year 2006 and the petitioner has been apprehended in the year 2025 and due to conduct of the petitioner trial is kept pending for about 19 years.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation leveled against the petitioner as well as material available on record, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the



petitioner is hereby rejected.

8. If the trial of the petitioner is not concluded within
six months, he may renew the prayer for bail.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

Nilmani/-

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

