

COURT OF DISTRICT & ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-II, BARH (PATNA)

B.P No. 280 of 2026

*Arising out of Mokama P.S. Case No. 339 of 2025
(u/s 309 (4) of BNS)*

1. Sudarshan Kumar @ Sanni Kumar S/O Vikash Singh @ Vikash Kumar Singh
..... **Petitioner**
(Resident of Village :- Malhipur, P.S.:- Chakiya, District:- Begusarai)

Vs.

State of Bihar **Opposite Party (O.P)**

For the petitioners : *Sri. Rajiv Kumar, Ld. Advocate*
For the O.P.(State) : *Sri Binod Kumar, Addl. Public Prosecutor*
=====

ORDER

13/07/2026

1. The regular bail application has been filed on the behalf of petitioner **Sudarshan Kumar @ Sanni Kumar**, who is in custody since 13/04/2026 in connection with **Mokama P.S. Case No. 339 of 2025** registered **u/s 309 (4) of BNS**.

2. Heard, the Ld. Counsel for the petitioners and the Ld. APP for the state.

3. This case has been instituted on the basis of fard-beyan of Santosh Ram who alleged that on 22/08/2025 at around 01:00 AM driving the Bolero pickup loaded with poultry feed and heading towards Harnaut. It is further alleged that he had parked his vehicle on NH-31 at around 05:20 AM then, three miscreants came armed with pistol and got onto the vehicle and took him towards Hartali Mor and thereafter, forcibly got him off the vehicle and fled away with vehicle. Subsequently, FIR was registered.

4. The Ld. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that there is no incriminating article recovered from his possession to show his involvement in the commission of alleged offence. Further, the confessional statement made before the police admitting his guilt, has got no evidentiary value in the eyes of law. Furthermore, from bare reading of FIR, it appears that the informant alleged to identify the miscreants upon seeing them despite that he was put to be identification parade. Hence, prays for enlarging the petitioner on bail.

6. The Ld. APP opposed the prayer of bail submitting that the petitioner has two criminal antecedent except this case. So, the petitioner does not deserve to be granted bail.

Cont'd/-....

COURT OF DISTRICT & ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-II, BARH (PATNA)

B.P No. 280 of 2026

13/07/2026 (Cont'd/-....)

7. Heard both the sides and perused the case record as well as case diary. From the perusal of record, it transpires that there is no cogent evidence available in the case diary against this petitioner except his confessional statement. Further, this petitioner is in custody since 13/04/2026 and charge-sheet has already been submitted upon completion of investigation. So, further detention of the accused petitioner would not serve any fruitful purpose.

8. In the light of aforesaid facts and taking into account the period of detention undergone by the accused petitioner, let the petitioner namely **Sudarshan Kumar @ Sanni Kumar** be released on bail on furnishing bond Rs. 10,000/- with two sureties of like amount each to the satisfaction of Ld. Trial Court, with further condition:- (i) That one of the bailors shall be close relative of the petitioner. (ii) that the petitioner shall not influence the witness of this case or temper with the evidence. (iii) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused (iv) the petitioner shall co-operate with trial and ensure his presence on each and every date fixed by the court, failing which his bail bond shall liable to be cancelled by the Court concerned.

Dictated & Corrected

Sd/-
(Manish Kumar)
Addl. Sessions Judge-II,
Barh (Patna)

Memo No. Dated July, 2026

Copy forwarded to : The Court of **Ld. ACJM-III, Barh.**

(Manish Kumar)
Addl. Sessions Judge-II,
Barh (Patna)