

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE - IV
DISTRICT – SHEOHAR**

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

Regular Bail Petition (B.P.) No. 97 / 2026

(Arising from Piprahi P.S. Case No. 165/2026 U/s. 304(2) B.N.S.)

Ajmat Khan, S/o- Lal Khan, aged about 21 years

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Bihar.....Opposite Party

Appearance -

For the Petitioner : Sri Akhilesh Kumar, Advocate.

For the State : Sri Arshad Siddiqui, Addl. Public Prosecutor, Sheohar.

ORDER

29.06.2026

Heard the learned advocate for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State. Perused the copy of the up to date case diary.

This petition for grant of regular bail was filed on behalf of the above-named petitioner who is in custody since 25.05.2026 in connection with Piprahi P.S. Case No. 165/2026 registered on 24.05.2026 under section 304(2) the B.N.S.

The prosecution's case in brief is that on 24.05.2026 at about 10 A.M., when the informant came out from Dekuli Dharampur Dham and checked his pocket, he found it empty. It is further alleged that when he checked C.C.T.V. footage, the petitioner was found to have pick pocketed the informant. It is further stated that the informant dialed 112 and the petitioner was later arrested by the police.

It has been averred at the outset in para 2 of the petition that no other bail petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner either before this court or Hon'ble High Court, Patna and in para 3 that the petitioner has one criminal antecedent viz. Piprahi P.S. Case No. 166/2026 u/s 262 of the I.P.C.

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE - IV
DISTRICT – SHEOHAR**

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

**B.P. No. 97/ 2026
Ajmat Khan Vs. State of Bihar**

ORDER

29.06.2026 The learned advocate has further submitted that the petitioner is innocent and falsely implicated in this case due to dirty politics. As a matter of fact, nothing was recovered from the possession of the petitioner and notice was not issued under section 35(3) B.N.S.S. to the petitioner despite the offence being punishable with imprisonment for a term which is less than seven years. It has been prayed that the petitioner deserved to be granted anticipatory bail. The learned A.P.P. has opposed the bail petition.

Now, it transpires from perusal of record that the petitioner is named as accused in this case and the allegations have been broadly supported by the informant and two other witnesses, who are C.C.T.V. operators, in their statements recorded during the investigation. However, it has been pointed out that the informant has not mentioned the exact amount of cash which he kept in his pocket, that the petitioner was detained and handed over to police by the informant along with the cash amount of Rs.450/-. Moreover, the allegation relates to offence which is punishable with imprisonment for a term which is less than seven years and the case is triable by any Magistrate. Although, no criminal antecedent has been recorded against the petitioner in the case diary, the petitioner admittedly has one criminal antecedent which does not appear to be in relation to similar offence. The petitioner is already in custody for over a month now.

In view of the above facts and circumstances, and also taking into account the period of custody, I find it reasonable to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The prayer is hereby **allowed**. The petitioner is accordingly ordered to be enlarged on bail upon furnishing bail bonds of **Rs.10,000** with **two sureties of like amount each** to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court, subject to **filing of undertaking in terms of section 480 (3) B.N.S.S.**

(Dictated & Corrected)

Sd/-

**Addl. Sessions Judge, IV
Sheohar**