

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.38506 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -116 Year- 2017 Thana -TAJPUR District- SAMASTIPUR

=====

Ranjan Kumar Sah @ Balajee, Son of Ram Balak Sah, resident of Village-
Rampur Singhara, P.S.- Mahua, District- Vaishali.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Shyameshwar Kumar Singh, Adv.
Mr. Chaitanya Swaroop, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jagdhar Prasad, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 19-08-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

The petitioner, in the present case, is seeking regular bail in connection with Tajpur (Waini O.P.) P.S. Case No.116 of 2017, registered for offences alleged under Sections 395, 397 and 412 of the Indian Penal Code.

A perusal of the First Information Report would show that there was a gang of the accused persons who looted away the vehicle in which informant was going on. The accused persons intercepted the informant's vehicle by placing their Bolero in front of his pickup van and then they looted away cash of Rs.1,15,000/- and three mobile phones from the possession of the



informant. The informant chased the accused persons with the help of police, thereupon the pickup van became unbalanced and turned down, thereafter the Bolero vehicle was also intercepted by the police party. Three accused persons were arrested from the pickup van and the rest three accused persons were arrested from the Bolero. The petitioner has been admittedly arrested from the Bolero which was involved in the present occurrence. The police has recovered certain arms and ammunitions from the accused persons. In the FIR the name of this petitioner has also been shown as possessing one pistol and live cartridges, however submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that this part of the allegation is not correct inasmuch as there is no seizure list showing such recovery from the possession of this petitioner.

On the other hand, learned APP opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that, in any view of the matter, this petitioner was a member of the gang who had committed this serious offence of looting the vehicle and cash etc. from the possession of the informant.

In the facts and circumstances of the present case, I am not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner at this stage. The petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.



This application stands dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Arvind/-

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

