

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1140 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-232 Year-2024 Thana- SARAI District- Vaishali

=====

Ankit Kumar Pathak S/O Bipin Pathak @ Bipin Kumar Pathak R/O Village-
Rampur Baghel, P.S- Sahdei,(Deshari), District- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Amit Kumar Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party : Mr. Ajit Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 12-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. This is the second attempt on behalf of the
petitioner for grant of regular bail in connection with Sarai P.S.
Case No.232 of 2024 registered for the offence under sections
317(2), 310(4/5) of the B.N.S., 2023 and sections 25(1-b)a, 26
and 35 of the Arms Act.

3. Earlier, the bail of the petitioner was rejected
by this Court vide order dated 23.07.2025 passed in Criminal
Miscellaneous No.17816 of 2025. The aforesaid order dated
23.07.2025 reads as under:-

*“Heard the learned counsel for the
petitioner and learned APP for the State.*

*2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in
connection with Sarai P.S. Case No.232 of
2024 registered for the offence under Sections
317(2), 310(4/5) of the BNS and Sections 25(1-
b)a, 26 and 35 of the Arms Act.*

*3. As per the prosecution case, while the
criminals were preparing to commit a crime,
the police caught them and there is recovery of
one country made pistol, two live cartridges*



and one mobile phone from the petitioner. The other recoveries are also there from the other co-accused. The petitioner is accused in eight more case out of which there are two cases of murder.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 16.10.2024.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the criminal antecedent of the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this application for regular bail is hereby rejected.

7. The Court below is directed to expedite the trial of the petitioner after framing of charge.”

4. Considering the fact that the petitioner has eight antecedents, I am not inclined to review my earlier order dated 23.07.2025. Accordingly, this bail application is dismissed.

5. The trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same at the earliest.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

pawan/-

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

