

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.34644 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -63 Year- 2016 Thana -RAJAPAKAR District- VAISHALI(HAJIPUR)

=====

Triloki Singh, S/o Akhilesh Singh, R/o village- Banghara, P.S.- Rajapakar,
District- Vaishali.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anish Chandra

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Tarkeshwar Nath Thakur

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 09-09-2016 Heard Sri Harendra Kumar, learned counsel who was

assisted by Sri Anish Chandra, learned counsel for the petitioner
and Sri Damodar Prasad Tiwary, learned Additional Public
Prosecutor.

The sole petitioner apprehending his arrest in
Rajapakar P.S. Case No. 63 of 2016 registered for the offence
under section 414/34 of the Indian Penal Code, has prayed for
grant of bail in the event of his arrest or surrender.

It was submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner
that it is true that petitioner was named as accused in the F.I.R.
but on perusal of the F.I.R. it is itself evident that his name has
come on the basis of confessional statement of one of the co-
accused who was apprehended by the Police. It has been argued

that from conscious possession of the petitioner nothing was recovered and he has been implicated due to dirty village politics. On aforesaid grounds he has prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

Learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposing the prayer submits that immediately after arrival of the police party all accused persons fled away however after chase one of the accused who was apprehended disclosed the name of other associates. He further submits that in this case on the basis of disclosure number of stolen motorcycles with different number plates were recovered. Altogether eight motorcycles said to be stolen were recovered. Besides this petitioner is having criminal antecedent which fact has been mentioned in paragraph no. 3 of the petition.

In view of the nature of accusation and antecedent of the petitioner, the court considers it not a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

The petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

Praful/-

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