

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.21016 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -27 Year- 2017 Thana -DELHA District- GAYA

=====

Chandan Kumar, S/o Bindeshwar Prasad, Resident of Village- Kharkhur
(Rajakothi), P.S.- Delha, District- Gaya.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar Verma

For the Opposite Party/s : Smt. Renuka Ratnakar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR
MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

2 18-05-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner is accused in connection with Delha
P.S. Case No. 27 of 2017 registered under Section 323, 341,
354(D), 384, 379, 504 of the Indian Penal Code and 66 (A), 67 of
the I.T. Act.

The allegation of informant, Navin Kumar Singh is
that on 11.02.2017 he received an objectionable message on his
mobile through mobile-SIM No. 8804693743 about his daughter
and on search, he came to know that Chandan Kumar (petitioner),
who was driver of his vehicle after forming group of three mobile-
SIMs, is doing so on account of the fact that he wants to perform
the marriage with his daughter, otherwise the informant will be



insulted. He also demanded Rs.2,00,000/- from the informant.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that in fact the petitioner was driver of the vehicle of the informant and due to demand of wage as due, the present case has been lodged. The petitioner having no criminal antecedent, is in custody since 13.02.2017 and the charge-sheet has already been submitted in the present case.

Having regard to the facts and the circumstances of the case, the petitioner, above named, is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-VII, Gaya in connection with Delha P.S. Case No. 27 of 2017, subject to the condition that out of two sureties, one surety must be the close relative of the petitioner.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

Mahesh/-

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

