

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.22321 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -40 Year- 2016 Thana -GANDHIMAIDAN District- PATNA

1. Vivekanand Singh @ Vivek Singh Son of Jai Prakash Singh @ Devendra Singh resident of Mohalla- Gopalganj, P.S.- Sasaram, District- Rohtas.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Siddharth Harsh

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN SHARMA

ORAL ORDER

2 05-07-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel representing the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Gandhi Maidan P.S. Case No. 40 of 2016 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 364A/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegedly, P.S. Ravinath, the husband of the informant, was kidnapped with his Hyundai vehicle bearing Registration No. BR1AJ-6515. During investigation on the basis of ransom call made, the Police swung into action and when co-accused Md. Jamal Abdul Nasir and Raushan Kumar went to receive ransom amount at Patrol Pump, they were apprehended by the Police and on the basis of disclosure made by Md. Jamal Abdul Nasir, P. S. Ravinath, the victim was recovered from a lodge where the petitioner and co-accused Abhishek Kumar have kept confined the

victim and they were also arrested.

Submission is of false implication and that in the statement of the victim the petitioner is not named as kidnapper, he has taken a room on rent in the lodge of Abdul Nasir and he has been made victim of circumstances and he is 45 % handicapped, the petitioner is a student of Plus Two and preparing for engineering examination to which the learned APP dully assisted by learned counsel for the informant opposes by submitting that the victim was recovered from the room where the petitioner was also arrested and the victim has stated his name also.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, considering the allegation attributed against the petitioner serious in nature, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner 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 nine months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

avin/-

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