

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.64677 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-124 Year-2018 Thana- AMAS District- Gaya

-
1. Shubham Kumar, Son of Nityanand Singh, Resident of Village- Bikopur, P.S.- Atari, District- Gaya.
 2. Pinku Kumar Singh @ Pinku Kumar, Son of Rajendra Singh, Resident of Village- Basua, P.S Wazirganj, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Md. Javed Jafar Khan
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sri Nirmal Kumar Sinha

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRIYA
ORAL ORDER

3 04-12-2018 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioners seek bail in Amas P.S. Case No. 124/2018, instituted for offences under Section(s) 412 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Sections 25(1-B)A, 26 and 35 of Arms Act.

It is alleged in the written report that on receiving secret information that some miscreants have looted the money from the employee of Toll Plaza while he was depositing the same in Punjab National Bank, Amas, police party reached at the place of occurrence and saw two persons running away. On chase, police apprehended them, who disclosed their name as petitioners. On search, firearms and cash amount were



recovered from joint possession of these petitioners as mentioned in the seizure-list.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that other co-accused persons have already been granted bail by different Benches of this Court in Cr. Misc. Nos. 43556/2018 dated 20.07.2018 and 42751/2018 dated 12.09.2018.

From the aforesaid orders, it appears that aforesaid accused persons had been granted bail on the ground that they had not committed dacoity. They were villagers.

In the written report, there is allegation that both petitioners were caught on the spot and on search police recovered firearms as well as looted money from their possession.

Considering the aforesaid facts, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at this stage. Accordingly, prayer for bail of petitioners is rejected.

The trial court is directed to expedite the trial.

Petitioners are given liberty to renew the prayer for bail after six months of framing of charge in the event no substantive progress is made in trial.

(Sanjay Priya, J)

rakhi/-

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

