

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3018 of 2020**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-271 Year-2018 Thana- GOPALGANJ TOWN District-
Gopalganj

=====

Pintu @ Proshotam Singh @ Prusthum Singh, Son of Rabiendra Singh
Resident of Village - Sona Gopalpur, P.S.- Gopalpur, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anil Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Anita Kumari Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 20-03-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Gopalganj Town P.S. Case No. 271 of 2018, Tr. No.1857 of
2019, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 395,
397 of the Indian Penal Code.

The prosecution case in brief is that the informant, Dr.
Alok Kumar Suman, on the date of occurrence, i.e., on
07.06.2018 was sleeping in his residential house along with his
family members and at about midnight, seven unknown
miscreants entered into the house of the informant and on the
gun point looted ornaments, cloth and one licensee revolver and
other household article, worth Rs.20 to 25 lakhs, from the house



of the informant

Mr. Anil Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and he has falsely been implicated in this case on the basis of the fact that revolver of the informant was allegedly recovered from the possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel further submits that no seizure list has been prepared at the time of alleged recovery of revolver of informant from the possession of the petitioner and no test identification parade has been conducted by the investigating agency.

On the other hand, Ms Anita Kumari Singh, learned counsel appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for regular bail and submits that the petitioner is habitual offender and altogether nine cases are pending against the petitioner having the same allegation. Learned counsel further submits that the articles taken away from the house of the informant, i.e., licensee revolver has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner and the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of regular bail.

After having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the stolen articles from the house of the informant has been recovered from the possession



of the petitioner and the petitioner has got nine criminal antecedents of similar nature, I am not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner at this stage and prayer for the same is hereby rejected.

However, if there is no substantial progress in the trial, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after lapse of six months.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

sanjeev/-

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

