

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.29545 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -24 Year- 2018 Thana -PASRAHA District- KHAGARIA

=====

1. Raghuni Yadav, Son of Late Biranchi Yadav, Resident of Village-Bandehra, P.S.- Pasraha, District- Khagaria.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. S. Ehteshamuddin

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 29-06-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioner, who is in custody since 07.03.2018, seeks bail in connection with Pasraha P.S. Case No. 24/2018 registered for an offence punishable under section 395 of the Indian Penal Code.

The informant of this case is driver of a passenger bus. In his written report, he has alleged that in the night of 01.03.2018 at about 1:30 (mid-night) when he reached near the place of occurrence, saw obstruction on road by putting electric pole. When he stopped the bus, 8-10 unknown miscreants rushed towards bus and on the point of pistol snatched Rs.15,000/- and a mobile sets from his possession. The said miscreants further looted few more vehicles which reached near the place of occurrence and thereafter they all escaped.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner is innocent having clean antecedent and his name has been divulged by the co-accused and except the disclosure of his name by the other co-accused there is nothing against him and so he deserves to be enlarged on bail.

The learned Additional Public Prosecutor on the other hand opposed the submission.

On perusal of case diary it appears that in course of investigation, one Hazari Mandal was apprehended who confessed his complicity in the above crime. He also disclosed the name of this petitioner and other associates involved in the above crime. The police immediately rushed at the place of petitioner and on search, a mobile-phone which was stolen from informant was recovered from the house of the petitioner. The said mobile was being used by inserting another SIM standing in the name of the wife of the petitioner. The said recovery was made within a week of the occurrence.

Considering the above materials showing complicity of petitioner in above crime, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. His bail prayer stands rejected.

(Sanjay Kumar, J)

Mahesh/-

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

