

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.1843 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -455 Year- 2017 Thana -SONEPUR District- SARAN

=====

Pankaj Kumar, Son of Baij Nath Rai, resident of Village Manpur P.S.
Sonpur, District- Saran.

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Mukesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party: Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL ORDER

2 11-01-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner is in custody since 22.10.2017 in connection with Sonpur P.S. Case No. 455 of 2017 for the offences alleged under Sections 420, 467, 468, 469, 471, 470 and 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code, Sections 3 and 4 of the Bihar Conduct of Examination Act, 1981 and Section 66(D) of the Information and Technology Act, 2000.

3. It is submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated merely on the extra-judicial confessional statement of co-accused Deo Nath Rai, who is said to have stated that he supplied answer-sheet to the petitioner in order to help his wife. It is submitted that the petitioner is not named in the first information report which named as many as 36 persons. The petitioner claims clean antecedents.

4. Be that as it may, having regard to the entirety of the facts and circumstances of the case and having regard to the period of custody of the above named petitioner since 22.10.2017, let him be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of like amount each to the



satisfaction of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-1, Saran in connection with Sonpur P.S. Case No. 455 of 2017, on the following conditions:-

(i) That one of the bailors shall be a close relative of the petitioner.

(ii) That the petitioner shall not indulge in any similar offence till conclusion of the trial.

(iii) That the petitioner shall remain physically present in court on each and every date during trial and in the event of failure on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be liable to be cancelled by the learned Court concerned.

(iv) The petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation, if not already concluded, and make himself available as and when so required and in case of failure, the State shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/Chandran

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

