

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.8306 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -84 Year- 2014 Thana -ARA NAGAR District- BHOJPUR

=====

1. Md. Mallu @ Mallu Rain @ Md. Majhar @ Mumtaj son of Md. Rustam
resident of Mohalla- Kasai Tola, P.s. Ara Town, District- Bhojpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

with

Criminal Miscellaneous No.11838 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -84 Year- 2014 Thana -ARA NAGAR District- BHOJPUR

=====

1. Guddu Miya Son of Jalil Miya R/o Village + Mohalla Rauza, P.S. Ara
Town, District Bhojpur

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

(In Cr.Misc. No.8306 of 2015)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prakash Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Amitesh Kumar (APP)

(In Cr.Misc. No.11838 of 2015)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajani Ranjan Pd. Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sharda Kumari (APP)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI

SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

3 10-04-2015 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and

learned Additional Public Prosecutors appearing on behalf

of the State.

The petitioners are in custody since 18.11.2014 in a

case registered for the offences punishable under Sections

392 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegedly, a total sum of Rs. 69,000/- and odd is said to have been snatched by the miscreants from the informant while he was moving in a motorcycle.

Learned counsels for the petitioners have submitted that the petitioners are not involved with the present occurrence and they have been remanded in the present matter merely on the basis of suspicion and there is no material against them over and above confessional statements before the police which they in fact never made. They have also submitted that the petitioners have not been put on Test Identification Parade so far though the informant is said to have been identified. It is contended that there is no recovery from the possession of the petitioners and therefore, no purpose would be served by keeping the petitioners any more in the present matter.

From the averments made in paragraph 3 of the application, I find that the petitioners are involved in other cases of serious nature.

I am not inclined to grant the petitioners the privilege

of bail for the present. These applications for bail are rejected.

The petitioners shall, however, be at liberty to renew their prayer for bail after six months, if there is no substantial progress in the trial.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

ArunKumar/-

U			
---	--	--	--