

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.39600 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -235 Year- 2017 Thana -SAMASTIPUR MUFFASIL District-
SAMASTIPUR

=====

1. Chandan Kumar @ Bhola Rai aged about 36 Years , Son of Late Durga Rai, R/o Village/Mohalla- Mohanpur, P.S.- Samastipur (Mufasil), District-Samastipur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satish Kumar
For the Informant : Mr. Arbind Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri S. Ehteshamuddin

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 01-09-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 384, 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code in connection with Samastipur (Muffasil) P.S. Case No. 235/2017.

Allegation against the petitioner is of demand of extortion form the informant.

Submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case as the informant was interested in purchasing the land near his workshop, which belongs to the petitioner, but the petitioner was not ready to



sell the same and as such the informant lodged the case against the petitioner. It is also submitted that the petitioner is accused in three other cases also, but all the cases have been lodged at the instance of the informant. In this case the petitioner is in custody for three months.

Heard learned Additional Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the informant also. They have opposed the prayer of bail and stated that earlier a case had lodged by the informant against the petitioner with respect to earlier demand and when the petitioner started threatened him to withdraw the case, i.e. Muffasil P.S. Case No. 126/2017, the present case has been lodged and apart from that there are two other cases also against the petitioner, as such he does not deserve bail.

Having heard both sides, in view of the facts, stated above, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner, above named, on bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

However, the trial court is directed to expedite the trial and try to conclude the same within a period of nine months.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J.)

Rakhi

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

