

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.27165 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -118 Year- 2011 Thana -PIPRA District- SUPAUL

=====

1. Saroj Yadav @ Pappu Yadav @ Saroj @ Pappu Kumar @ Pappu S/o
Late Chandeshwari Yadav Resident of village - Koshali Patti, P.S. Pipra,
District - Supaul

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rakesh Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Yogendra Kumar Singh(App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT KUMAR
SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

2 03-08-2015 Heard learned counsel for petitioner and

learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

Earlier prayer for bail of the petitioner was rejected by a coordinate bench of this court vide order dated 09-10-2012 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 34823 of 2012 giving liberty to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail before the trial court itself after examination of the victim but submission on behalf of the petitioner is that even by issuance of non-bailable warrant of arrest, the victim is not being produced before the trial court by the prosecution. It is also pointed out that the victim has already been released in favour of her father. Furthermore, it is contended that the

victim in her statement recorded u/S 164 of the Cr.P.C. did not make any complain of misbehaviour at the hands of the petitioner. Moreover, the victim was produced before the police by the informant himself before recording her statement u/S 164 of the Cr.P.C.

Taking note of the aforesaid facts and circumstances as well as submission of the parties and also keeping in mind the period of detention of the petitioner in jail custody, let the petitioner named above, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each in connection with Pipra P.S. Case No. 118 of 2011 corresponding to Sessions Trial No. 26 of 2014 to the satisfaction of Additional Sessions Judge-II, Supaul subject to condition that if any complaint of tampering with the prosecution evidence is made before the trial court, the trial court may take steps in accordance with law after due and proper inquiry.

(Hemant Kumar Srivastava, J)

A.K.V./-

U		T	
---	--	---	--