

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.31830 of 2012

=====

The State Of Bihar

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

Ranjeet Rai Son Of Suresh Rai Resident Of Village - Surmaye Meari, P.S. -
Sarairanjan , District - Samastipur

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajendra Nath Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH KUMAR
SINGH

ORAL ORDER

02/ 28-09-2016

The present application has been filed for cancellation of bail of opposite party granted vide order dated 08.09.2010 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 32711 of 2010 in connection with Sarairanjan P.S. Case No. 18 of 2010 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 25(1-B)a/26 of the Arms Act, pending in the court of learned CJM, Samastipur.

The cancellation has been sought for on the ground that subsequent to the present case Musrigharari P.S. Case No. 101 of 2011 was registered under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code but subsequently during investigation the name of opposite party sprang up, statement to that effect has been made in paragraph 6 of the petition. It is further submitted that the opposite party is accused in four other cases, statement to that effect has

been made in paragraph 6 of the petition, which reads as follows:-

“That it is stated that the opposite party is a dreaded criminal of the locality and has a series of criminal antecedents behind him:-

- (i) Valigaon (Vaishali) P.S. Case No. 53 of 2005 for the offence under Section 414 of the Indian Penal Code and section 25(1-B)a/26 of the Arms Act
- (ii) Ujiarpur P.S. Case No. 36 of 2010 for the offence under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code
- (iii) Sarairanjan P.S. Case No. 18 of 2010 for the offence under section 25(1-B)a/26 of the Arms Act and
- (iv) Musrigharari P.S. Case No. 102 of 2011 for the offence under section 392 of the Indian Penal Code.”

Neither the FIRs described in paragraph no. 6 of the petition nor the material collected against the petitioner in those cases have been brought on record.

Hence, considering the fact that the opposite party has enjoyed the privilege of bail for six years, this Court is not inclined to cancel the bail of opposite party no. 2.

Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Dinesh Kumar Singh, J)

DKS/-

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