

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.55592 of 2016**

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -11 Year- 2016 Thana -IMADPUR District- BHOJPUR

=====

1. Sanni Kumar @ Pradeep Kumar, Son of Sri Ravi Shankar Singh,  
Resident of Village/Mohalla- Barka Gain, P.S.- Tarari, District- Bhojpur.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... .... Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Anil Kumar Singh 1

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR**  
**JHA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      17-03-2017                      Heard both sides.

The petitioner seeks bail in Imadpur P.S. case No. 11  
of 2016 under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code.

The informant alleged that he withdrew Rs. 96,000/-  
from the Central Cooperative Bank, Tarari, Bhojpur and was  
going towards Bihta, three boys came near village Dharmapura and  
snatched Rs. 1,01,000/- from his possession.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that  
petitioner is not named in the FIR. The name of the petitioner  
figured in the case in the subsequent statement of the informant  
recorded in paragraph 61 of the case diary but even then the  
petitioner has not been put in T. I. parade. The informant is said to  
have shown the CCTV footage of Punjab National Bank installed in the



premises of which robbery was committed on 02.05.2016 and on the basis of aforesaid footage the petitioner is also made accused in the present case as the informant is said to have identified the petitioner and one Mannu Kumar, who are alleged to have snatched the money. It is submitted that petitioner has already been enlarged on bail in Imadpur P.S. case No. 15 of 2016 registered under Section 392 of the IPC on the ground that petitioner was not put in T. I. parade but from perusal of the aforesaid order and the case diary, it appears that the occurrence took place on 12.04.2016. The informant lodged the case against unknown. On 02.05.2016 another robbery was committed and photographs of the criminals were taken out from the CCTV and shown to the informant of the present case. The informant identified the petitioner and one Mannu Kumar.

Considering the facts aforesaid, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

The petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after remaining one year in custody.

**(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)**

BKS/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

