

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-I, GAYA
BAIL PETITION No. 1413/2026

Sonu Kumar S/o Raju Singh @ Guddu Kumar
R/o Haridaspur, P.S.- Kudra, District- Kaimur

----- Petitioner

VERSUS

The State of Bihar

----- Opposite Party

19.08.2026

This bail application has been filed on behalf of the above named accused/petitioner, who is in judicial custody since 07.03.2026, in connection with ***Bhabhua Rail P.S. Case No. 40/2025***, for the offences registered **U/s. 303(2), 316(2), 318(4) of B.N.S. & Section 67B, 67C of IT Act., pending in the Court of Ld. A.C.J.M., Railway Court, Gaya.**

2. Heard both the sides on the bail application.

3. Learned defence counsel, submitted that prior to this, the petitioner has not filed either anticipatory or regular bail petition before this Court or before the Hon'ble Patna High Court. It is further submitted that petitioner is innocent, committed no offence and has falsely been implicated in this case. Petitioner has not caught on the spot and nothing has been recovered from his conscious possession. There is no independent witness except official. Lastly he submitted that petitioner has no criminal antecedent and he has been in judicial custody since 07.03.2026. Hence, it is prayed to grant the bail to the accused petitioner.

4. Per contra the Ld. A.P.P. appeared on behalf of State opposed the prayer for bail.

5. Prosecution case, in brief, as per the informant is that on August 22, 2025, at approximately 6:25 A.M., he was traveling from Roorkee station to Dhanbad railway station by train number 13152, coach number S-7, berth number 12. He fell asleep during the journey and when the train arrived at Bhabhua railway station at approximately 3:50 A.M. on August 23, 2025, he woke up and noticed that his Samsung A-305 mobile phone, which was plugged into the charging point, was missing. He searched his phone at his own level but was unable to find it. When he contacted the Bank of India toll-free number to close his bank account, customer service informed him that someone had withdrawn a total of ₹39,500 from his bank account in four transactions through U.P.I.

6. Heard both the parties and perused the material available on record. From perusal, it appears that petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. but during investigation his name has come into the picture. The allegation alleged in the F.I.R. that when informant fell asleep during the journey, someone has stolen his mobile and thereafter was withdrawn 39,500/- in four transactions by way of using his mobile number. Vide para 35 of the case diary, on the basis of IMEI Number it was found that the stolen mobile has been using after inserting SIM No. 9354765104 and through S.D.R. number, it was found that the sim is registered

in the name of Sanjay S/o Manoj Bind. On inquiry from the Sanjay, it has been stated that this mobile has been given by accused petitioner Sonu Kumar. Vide para 38 of the case diary, Cyber fraud Sonu Kumar (accused petitioner) has transferred Rs. 5,000/- in the account of Deepak Kumar, Rs. 20,000/- transferred in the account of Ayodhya Sharma and Rs. 14,500/- transferred in the account of Kamlesh Kumar through UPI from the account of Pravir Mukherji (informant). Vide para 42 of the case diary, the statement of informant in which he has stated that he was called on his phone by all three accused petitioners and admitted to have received the alleged amount in their account, which was sent by cyber fraud/ accused petitioner Sonu Kumar through UPI. Vide para 58 & 59 of the case diary, the confessional statement of accused petitioner Sonu Kumar in which he admitted his guilt and also admitted that he had transferred the alleged amount in the account of co-accused persons. Charge-sheet has been submitted against the accused petitioner after finding the case true against him. Moreover the anticipatory bail of co-accused persons in which accounts, the amount of Rs. 39,500/- has been transferred by the accused petitioner from the mobile of informant have already been rejected by this Court vide A.B.P. No.1797/2026, dated 23.06.2026.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, gravity of offence as well as new manner of the offence which is being adopted by the offender and the effect of this offence on the society, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer of bail filed and moved on behalf of the petitioner, above named, is hereby **rejected**.

(Dictated)

Sd/-
(Shashi Kant Ojha)
Addl. Sessions Judge-1, Gaya
19.08.2026