

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.18102 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -94 Year- 2016 Thana -SASARAM NAGAR District- SASARAM
(ROHTAS)

=====

1. Vijendra Chaudhari @ Bijendra Chaudhari son of Kameshwar Chaudhari
resident of Village- Shivpur Chitauli, Police Station Sasaram (T), District-
Rohtas at Sasaram.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raghunandan Kumar Singh

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

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

3 28-06-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. representing the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sasaram
(T) P.S. Case No. 94 of 2016 registered for the offence punishable
under Section 364-A/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegedly, Satyam, aged 4 years, grand-son of the
informant, became traceless and during enquiry it reveals that the
petitioner and other co-accused had taken away Satyam on
motorcycle for ransom. During investigation the petitioner and
other two F.I.R. named accused persons were apprehended with
the victim when they were going with motorcycle.

Submission is of false implication and that the

petitioner has been made victim of the circumstances, without any fault he is suffering in custody since 24.01.2016, having no criminal antecedent.

The learned APP seriously opposes the prayer of bail by submitting that the petitioner and two co-accused were arrested when they were taking away the victim boy on motorcycle vide para-10 of the case diary and further they have confessed their guilt also.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, considering the allegation attributed against the petitioner, serious in nature, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and accordingly, his such prayer stands rejected in connection with Sasaram (T) P.S. Case No. 94 of 2016 pending in the Court of learned CJM, Rohtas at Sasaram.

However, considering the detention of the petitioner, let the trial be expedited and concluded within a period of nine months from the date of receipt or production of a copy of this order.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

sushma/-

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