

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No. 28921 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -668 Year- 2016 Thana -MADHEPURA District- MADHEPURA

- =====
1. Domi Yadav, Son of Late Siyaram Yadav, R/o Village- Chakla Laxmi-Rampur, P.S. & District- Madhepura.
 2. Ramanand Yadav, Son of Late Ayodhi Yadav.
 3. Pintu Yadav, Son of Ramanand Yadav.
 4. Sadanand Yadav, Son of Ramanand Yadav, Petitioner Nos.2 to 4 are Resident of Village- Khajuri, P.S.- Sour Bazar, District- Saharsa.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Surendra Kumar Singh and Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh, Advocates
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Akshay Lal Pandit, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 11-08-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend arrest in Madhepura
P.S. Case No. 668 of 2016 dated 29.10.2016 instituted under Sections
147/341/323/379 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The allegation against the petitioners and two
others is that they had snatched Rs. 1,50,000/- cash from the
informant and the petitioner no. 1 had attached him with butt of the
gun and upon cry being raised, they had run away.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted
that the informant side and the petitioner no. 1 side have past enmity



and due to this, false case has been lodged and for the same occurrence, there is also a counter case. It was submitted that the petitioners no. 2 to 4 are unconnected with any dispute with the informant and only because they are related to the petitioner no. 1, they have been falsely implicated in the present case. Learned counsel submitted that in the other case, in fact, on the fateful day, the petitioner no. 1 himself had withdrawn Rs. 1,00,000/- from the Bank from his own account through cheque and while he was coming, the informant side had looted that money whereas in the present case filed by the informant, the allegation is that Rs. 1,50,000/- taken out by the nephew of the informant on the previous day, had been looted.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State submitted that there is allegation of snatching Rs. 1,50,000/-.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties, in the event of arrest or surrender before the Court below within six weeks from today, the petitioners be released on bail upon furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Madhepura in Madhepura P.S. Case No. 668 of 2016, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) of the Code of



Criminal Procedure, 1973.

7. The petitioners shall cooperate in the trial and be present before the Court on each and every date. Failure to cooperate or appear on two consecutive dates, without sufficient cause, shall lead to cancellation of their bail bonds.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

AFR/NAFR	
U	
T	

