

In the Court of **Puneet Kumar Garg**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra  
**Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 946 of 2026 (Bapudham Motihari RPF P.S. Case No. 01/2026)**  
Sunil Mahto @ Sunil Kumar @ Gorakh @ Goraka V/s State of Bihar

**ORDER**

S.No.	Date	Contents	Remarks
01	10.03.2026	<p>1. Heard learned counsel representing the petitioner-accused as well as learned Public Prosecutor representing the State on anticipatory bail petition of petitioner-accused namely, <b>Sunil Mahto @ Sunil Kumar @ Gorakh @ Goraka</b>, apprehending his arrest in this Bapudham Motihari RPF P.S. Case No. 01/2026, registered under Section 3 R.P. (U.P.) Act, 1966, pending in the Court of learned Railway Magistrate, Sonpur-Saran.</p> <p>2. FIR of this case has been registered on the basis of a written application of the informant, namely, <i>Amrendra Kumar Chaubey</i>, stating therein that at Kaanti Yard, between Location No. 99/27-99/29 on the up line, the auxiliary transformer installed there was thrown down by some unknown persons. The copper winding coil fitted in the said transformer was stolen and the transformer oil filled in it was completely drained out. In a joint inquiry report, an estimate for loss of Rs. 36,500/- to the Railway has been reported.</p> <p>3. It is asserted on behalf of learned counsel representing the petitioner-accused that he is quite innocent, has not committed any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. and has falsely been implicated in this false case due to previous enmity. Next added that earlier no ABP or regular bail has been filed on behalf of the petitioner-accused in this Court or Hon'ble High Court, Patna in connection with the present case and he has got clean antecedent. Next contended that the case was registered against the unknown accused persons and the petitioner's name has come from the confessional statement of the co-accused of this case. Further submitted that the co-accused of this case has been granted bail by this Court <i>vide</i> order dated 11.02.2026 passed in A.B.P. No. 585/2026. Next asserted that the petitioner-accused is ready to furnish sureties as required by the Court. Therefore, it is prayed that the petitioner-accused may be enlarged on anticipatory bail.</p> <p>4. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor representing the State vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner-accused.</p> <p>5. Heard both the sides and perused the relevant materials available on record. From the record, it appears that the present</p>	

In the Court of **Puneet Kumar Garg**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra  
**Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 946 of 2026 (Bapudham Motihari RPF P.S. Case No. 01/2026)**  
Sunil Mahto @ Sunil Kumar @ Gorakh @ Goraka V/s State of Bihar

**ORDER**

	<p>case has been instituted against unknown persons and the name of this petitioner-accused has surfaced during investigation from the confessional statement of the co-accused of this case. It further appears that the co-accused of this case has already been granted bail by this Court <i>vide</i> order dated 11.02.2026 passed in ABP No. 585/2026 and the alleged loss amount of Rs. 36,500/- to the Railway has already been deposited. Since the said amount has already been paid, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner-accused under apprehension of arrest.</p> <p><b>6.</b> So, considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the reasons mentioned herein-above, this <b>Anticipatory Bail Petition</b>, bearing <b>No. 946 of 2026</b>, is hereby <b>allowed</b>. In the event of his arrest or surrender within one month from this order, the petitioner-accused, namely, <b>Sunil Mahto @ Sunil Kumar @ Gorakh @ Goraka</b>, be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of <b>Rs. 10,000/-</b> <u>with two sureties</u> of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court concerned subject to the conditions as laid down u/s 482(2) of B.N.S.S., 2023 :--</p> <p><b>(I)</b> That the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by I.O., as and when required,</p> <p><b>(II)</b> That the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to the I.O. of the case,</p> <p><b>(III)</b> That the petitioner shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court,</p> <p><b>(IV)</b> That the petitioner is directed to co-operate in trial and disposal of the case.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[Dictated]</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(Puneet Kumar Garg),</b> Sessions Judge, Saran 10.03.2026</p>	