

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**

**Criminal Miscellaneous No.51571 of 2018**

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -342 Year- 2017 Thana -TAJPUR District- SAMASTIPUR

=====

Dinesh Kumar Jha, Son of Sri Sushil Kumar Jha, Resident of Village -  
Ashadhi, Police Station - Tajpur, District - Samastipur.

.... .... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar.

.... .... Opposite Party

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Sr. Advocate and  
Mr. Mukund Mohan Jha, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party : Mr. Rajendra Prasad Nat, A.P.P.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      19-09-2018                      Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner and  
learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner is languishing in custody since  
22.06.2018 in a case for the offence registered under Sections 147,  
148, 149, 302, 307, 324, 338, 337, 353, 354(B), 379, 427, 436,  
447 of the IPC and 3 of the Prevention of Damage to Public  
Property Act, 1984.

The prosecution story, in brief, is that 400-500  
unknown persons attacked at Tajpur Police Station and shouting  
slogan against police administration. They were throwing the  
bricks on police party. They damaged the police jeep and private  
jeep of police officials and also set fire in the Government



Quarter. They also took away several articles of police station. Police made firing to control the situation. One person was injured with fire arm caused by person of mob.

It has been submitted by learned senior counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. Charge sheet has been submitted in the present case. There is no allegation of tampering with the witnesses alleged against the petitioner. In the said occurrence, a mob of 400-500 people were protesting against the police. Police made firing to handle the situation, in which one of the protestors was shot dead. Two cases were instituted for the same offence including the present one. The petitioner has been granted bail in other case. Initially the petitioner was not named in the present case. The name of the petitioner has transpired in the present case after a period of one year i.e., on 22.06.2018 on the basis of CCTV footage.

On behalf of the learned counsel for the State, it has been submitted that the petitioner is not named in the F.I.R.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, let the petitioner above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned C.J.M. Samastipur,



in connection with Tajpur P.S. Case No. 342 of 2017.

U.K./-

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

**(Sudhir Singh, J)**

