

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.18093 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -592 Year- 2016 Thana -DEHRI TOWN District- SASARAM
(ROHTAS)

=====

Abhinandan Kumar @ Rinku, Son of Kamala Singh, Resident of Village-
Chaudhary Chowk, P.S. Dalmianagar, District Rohtas.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank, Rohtas.

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Bikramdeo Singh, Advocate
For the informant : Mr. Suresh Prasad Singh No.1, Advocate
For the Opposite Party : Mr. Kumar Virendra Narayan (APP)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN SHARMA
ORAL ORDER

4 22-06-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the Bank and learned counsel representing the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Dehri (T)
P.S Case No. 592 of 2016 registered for the offences punishable
under Sections 408, 379, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegedly, the petitioner being sweeper in the Bank
of the Informant, after stealing the ATM Cards and PIN numbers
withdrew about Rs. 85,000/- with aid and assistance of his
associates from different ATM machines and in video footage the
petitioner has been identified and further he confessed his guilt.

Submission is of false implication and that the
petitioner has been made victim of the circumstances, he has got
no concern with the said *Almirah* where ATM Cards and register



of PIN numbers were kept, he is part time sweeper and has been implicated only with a view to save the skin of other officers who were involved in the crime. The confessional statement of the petitioner has got no evidentiary value in the eye of law and, as such, the petitioner deserves sympathetic consideration.

Learned A.P.P and learned counsel for the Bank oppose the prayer of bail by submitting that against the petitioner there is sufficient material and in V.D.O. footage also the petitioner has been identified and, as such, he does not deserves bail.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, considering the allegation attributed against the petitioner, at present, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and accordingly, his such prayer stands rejected in connection with Dehri (T) P.S. Case No. 592 of 2016, pending in the court of learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Dehri, District-Rohtas.

However, let the trial be expedited and concluded as early as possible preferably within six months and if the trial is not concluded within the said period, the petitioner if at no fault, may be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J.)

Rajiv/-

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

