

Criminal Miscellaneous No.48141 of 2018

1. Sanjay Das @ Sanjay Ravidas Son of Chitawan Das Resident of Village - Ranichak, P.S. Sherghati, District - Gaya.

Versus

.... Opposite Party/s

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar Pandey, A.P.P.

2 27-09-2018 Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to
make correction in the prayer portion of paragraph-1 of the
petition.

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

The Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Sessions Trial No. 01 of 2018/593/2017 arising out of Magadh Medical P.S. Case No. 213 of 2016 , under Sections 392 of the I.P.C. and later on also added Section 395 of the IPC.

Allegation as per F.I.R. is that the miscreants had committed dacoity in the Middle Bihar Gramin Bank, Sherghati Branch, Gaya on the point of pistol and looted away Rs.



20,29,640/-.

Submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. and he has falsely been implicated in this case only on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused, Rajesh Ravidas and Satyendra @ Niraj Das and it is also submitted that from the possession of petitioner one loaded pistol and two cartridges were recovered. It is also submitted that from the possession of petitioner new notes of only Rs. 100 and Rupees 50 new has been allegedly recovered , which is not the looted amount and the petitioner is in custody since 03.05.2017.

Heard learned A.P.P also.

Having heard both sides and in view of the facts and circumstances, as stated above, let the petitioner, above named, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty five thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional District Judge- IV, Gaya in connection with Sessions Trial No. 01/2018/593/2017 arising out of Magadh Medical P.S.Case No. 213 of 2016, subject to the following conditions:-

- i) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be a local person having sufficient immovable property



within the jurisdiction of the concerned Court.

- ii) The petitioner will not induce any witness or tamper with the evidence.
- iii) It is made clear that if petitioner found involved in any of the like offences, in future, prosecution is free to move for cancellation of his bail bonds.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

Sudha/-

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

