

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.45430 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -20 Year- 2014 Thana -ANDHRAMATH District- MADHUBANI

Rajesh Kumar Yadav @ Rajesh Kumar Son of Heera Yadav Resident of
Village- Dighiya, P.S.- Kishanpur, District- Supaul.

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

with

Criminal Miscellaneous No.48093 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -20 Year- 2014 Thana -ANDHRAMATH District- MADHUBANI

Suresh Yadav @ Surendra Yadav @ Bidyarthi @ Bidyarthi Yadav S/o Late
Nunu Lal Yadav Resident of village- Padampur, Police Station- Bihra,
District- Saharsa

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

Appearance :

(In Cr.Misc. No.45430 of 2014)

For the Petitioner : Mr. Bidhan Chandra Jha, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party : Mr. Sucheta Yadav(App)

(In Cr.Misc. No.48093 of 2014)

For the Petitioner : Mr. Bidhan Chandra Jha, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party : Mr. Raj Kishor Singh (App)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

6 15-04-2015 Since both the cases have arisen out of one occurrence, they
are being disposed of by this common order.

Heard both sides.

The petitioners seek bail in Andramath P.S. Case No. 20 of
2014, registered for the offences punishable under Section 395 of the
Indian Penal Code.

The informant lodged the case against five unknown persons for looting his belongings and motorcycle. The petitioners were apprehended and from possession of Suresh Yadav @ Surendra Yadav @ Bidyarthi @ Bidyarthi Yadav looted money Rs. 3,045/- along with arms and ammunitions were recovered. The police also recovered the motorcycle and looted articles from the possession of petitioner Rajesh Kumar Yadav @ Rajesh Kumar of Cr. Misc. No. 45430 of 2014.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have got no criminal antecedent.

Considering the facts aforesaid and the fact that since the looted articles were recovered from the possession of the petitioners, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners above named on bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

The trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same within nine months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, if the trial is not conclude the petitioners may renew his prayer for bail firstly in the court below.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J.)

KKSINHA/-

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