

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.47937 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -119 Year- 2011 Thana -LAXMIPUR District- JAMUI

=====

1. Munna Sao Son of Late Nageshwar Sao, Resident of Village - Rupabel,
P.S. - Khaira, District -Jamui.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Mishra

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rajendra Pd. Nat(App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN
SHARMA
ORAL ORDER

3 07-12-2015 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as

the learned A.P.P.

The petitioner seeks bail in a case for the offence
punishable under section 386 of the I.P.C

Allegedly, through mobile no. 8507162404 ransom of
Rs. 5,00,000/- was demanded by unknown failing which to kill all
the family members and he was stating his name Munna Sao
(Petitioner).

Submission is of false implication by the police, the
informant has submitted computerized type copy of the written
statement wherein by pen in the last line the name of the petitioner
has been added. The petitioner is not the owner of the mobile in
question and he is not relative of the owner of that mobile. The

petitioner has been taken on remand in this case without any cogent and legal material resulting he is suffering in custody since 06.04.2015.

The learned A.P.P. after going through the case diary fairly submits that one Birbal Hembram is the owner of the mobile in question but the petitioner has got criminal antecedent as he is involved in so many cases.

In the facts and circumstances as stated above, considering that no tangible and legal material has been collected during investigation against the petitioner save and accept his criminal antecedent and as such the petitioner is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of S.D.J.M. Jamui in Laxmipur P.S. Case No. 119 of 2011, subject to the conditions that one of the bailors must be a near relative and another having sufficient immovable property within the territorial jurisdiction of the court concerned and the petitioner shall remain present on each and every date during trial and the default on two consecutive dates on his part without any reason shall disentitle the petitioner from privilege of bail.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

Abhay/-

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