

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Miscellaneous No.41377 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -92 Year- 2017 Thana -KURTHA District- JEHANABAD

=====

1. Manoj Kumar @ Bhura Yadav S/o Late Chhotu Yadav, R/o Vill.- Kaitha
Lodipur, P.S.- Kurtha (Manikpur O.P.), District- Arwal.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Umesh Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anil Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 25-09-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned A.P.P. for the State.

The Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Kurtha (Manikpur O.P.) P.S. Case No. 92 of 2017 registered for
offences punishable under Sections 323, 324, 307, 504, 506 and
34 of the Indian Penal Code.

As per FIR, allegation against the petitioner is that
the petitioner along with others dismantling the wall in the land of
the informant and upon protest made by the informant, they
assaulted by means of spade on the head of the informant, causing
injuries. It is further alleged that earlier the bail petition of the
petitioner was rejected by the then Co-ordinate Bench of this
Court vide order dated 20.11.2017 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 52450
of 2017.

Submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner



2/2

is that earlier the bail petition of the petitioner was rejected with liberty to renew his prayer for bail after five months and the petitioner is in custody since 14.07.2017 and it is further submitted that there is no repetition of blow.

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 Chief Judicial Magistrate, Arwal in connection with Kurtha (Manikpur O.P.) P.S.Case No. 92 of 2017, 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/R.Ranjan-

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

