

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Miscellaneous No.14974 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -301 Year- 2016 Thana -MUZAFFARPUR SADAR District-
MUZAFFARPUR

=====

PUNNU KUMAR SINGH @ KESHAV SINGH Son of Sri Jitendra Singh,
Resident of Village- Katra, P.S. Katra, District- Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Babita Kumari

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Smt. Sucheta Yadav

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

4 27-04-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel representing the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Muzaffarpur
Sadar P.S. Case No. 301 of 2016 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 414, 412, 420, 120B/34 of the Indian
Penal Code and Sections 25(1-b)A/26/35 of the Arms Act.

Allegedly, during raid the petitioner and co-accused Munna
Singh were apprehended and from the tenanted room 5 country
made pistol, 8 cartridges of .315 bore, 2 cartridges of 12 bore, 15
cartridges of 7.65 bore, 5 pieces of magazine, several mobiles,
cash of Rs. 1,00,000/-, motorcycles, knives and other tools were
recovered, besides I D card and Aadhar Card etc., one gold chain
was also recovered and for that the petitioner did not produce any
paper.



Submission is of false implication and that it has not come during investigation that the room was of the petitioner, the owner of the house has not been examined, there is no legal and tangible material against the petitioner, nothing has come during investigation that the mobiles were stolen or snatched mobiles, no report of theft has come, without any fault the petitioner is suffering in custody since 28.05.2016 and as such he deserves sympathetic consideration. Recently he has been allowed bail in Muzaffarpur Sadar P.S. Case No. 290 of 2016 under Section 395 IPC.

Learned APP seriously opposes the prayer of bail by pointing out the alleged recovery.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, considering the alleged recovery, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail, accordingly, his such prayer stands rejected.

However, the petitioner may renew his prayer of bail after remaining further six months in custody.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

avin/-

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

