

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.31111 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -11 Year- 2014 Thana -PRANPUR District- KATIHAR

=====

1. Uttam Singh @ Amit Kumar Singh Son of Baccha Singh Resident of
village - Manihar, P.S. Manihari, District - Katihar

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nityanand(App)

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN
SHARMA**
ORAL ORDER

3 05-11-2015 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel representing the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Pranpur
P.S. Case No. 11 of 2014 registered for the offence punishable
under Section 395 of the Indian Penal Code

Allegedly, eight miscreants riding on four motorcycles
intercepted the informant when he was going with Mithu Sah after
taking cash of Rs. 4,40,000/- from Subodh Agrawal and snatched
the bag containing cash and further snatched the mobile of the
informant and mobile of Mithu Kumar Sah and also snatched the
key of the motorcycle at the point of pistol. Out of those
miscreants the petitioner was identified and he took the name of
co-accused Kaushar.

Submission is of false implication, it is not believable that the petitioner if known to the informant will commit such crime without covering his face, only due to earlier dispute the informant has taken the name of the petitioner, nothing has been recovered from his possession and the petitioner is suffering in custody since 23.12.2014.

Learned APP opposes the prayer of bail by submitting that the petitioner has been identified by the informant, during investigation Mithu Kumar Sah who was along with the informant has also taken the name of the petitioner and he has criminal antecedent also.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, at this stage, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above named on bail, accordingly, his such prayer stands rejected.

However, the trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same as early as possible, preferably within six months, taking the same on day to day basis, failing which the petitioner may be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

avin/-

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