

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.39408 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -17 Year- 2017 Thana -PAKRIDAYAL District-
EASTCHAMPARAN(MOTIHARI)

=====

1. Subodh Kumar Singh @ Subodh Singh Son of Ramchandra Kunwar,
Resident of Village-Dumarbana, P.S.-Pakaridayal, District-East Champaran

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Umesh Chandra Verma

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anil Kumar, APP

=====

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 387 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code in connection with Pakaridayal P.S. Case No. 17/2017.

Allegation, as per the F.I.R., is of demand of Rs. 30 lacs as extortion from a trade company. The petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. His name transpired in this case during course of investigation.

Submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that he has been made accused on the basis of criminal antecedent. Earlier he has been made accused in such type of seven cases. Except criminal antecedent there is nothing against the petitioner. He is in custody since 11.05.2017.



Heard learned Additional Public Prosecutor also. He opposed the prayer of bail of the petitioner on the ground that he is accused in such type of large number of cases, which will appear from case diary. From perusal of the case diary it would appear that the mobile is in the name of Sudhir Kumar. From the investigation, it appears that Sudhir Kumar had given that mobile to Mrityunjaya Thakur. Mrityunjaya Thakur made his explanation and in his explanation, he named the petitioner.

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, considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 11.05.2017, the trial court is directed to expedite the trial and at the same time, S.P., Katihar is also directed to ensure the attendance of witness so that the trial may be concluded as soon as possible.

With this direction, the application is disposed of.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J.)

Rakhi

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

