

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No. 50817 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -150 Year- 2015 Thana -DARBHANGA District- DARBHANGA

Rajesh Kumar, Son of Sikandar Prasad Yadav, Resident of Village-
Ahiyapur, P.S.- Ahiyapur, DIstrict- Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

with

Criminal Miscellaneous No. 50866 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -150 Year- 2015 Thana -DARBHANGA District- DARBHANGA

Vikky @ Vikky Kumar son of Bipin Prasad Sinha Resident of Village-
Sahwajpur ,P.s Ahiyapur ,District Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

Appearance :

(In Cr.Misc. No.50817 of 2015)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhay Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Suman Kri Singh(App)

(In Cr.Misc. No.50866 of 2015)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Hari Kishore Thakur

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. S.D.Singh Yadav(App)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2. 10-11-2015 In both the petitions, petitioners are in custody in connection with Darbhanga Town P.S. Case No. 150 of 2015 registered for the offence under Sections 392/411 of the Indian Penal Code. Accusation against the petitioners is that the informant was robbed by two occupants of tempo in question. The petitioner Vikky @ Vikky Kumar (in Cr.Misc. No. 50866 of 2015) was alleged as

driver of the said tempo. Immediately after commission of robbery, the informant raised an alarm, whereafter, the accused persons were chased and apprehended. All the three accused persons were apprehended and thereafter, the case was instituted.

Learned counsel for the petitioner in 1st case i.e. Cr.Misc. No. 50817 of 2015 submits that the petitioner has got clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated. Similarly, Sri Hari Kishore Thakur, learned counsel, who has appeared on behalf of petitioner namely Vikky @ Vikky Kumar, has argued that he was not at all knowing about the occurrence since he was a driver and he was apprehended due to act committed by two passengers.

Be that as it may, in view of nature of accusation and the fact that all the accused persons were apprehended at the place of occurrence itself, there is no reason to extend the privilege of bail.

Accordingly, both the petitions are rejected.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

Anay

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