

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2247 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-314 Year-2019 Thana- PAKARIBARAW District- Nawada

1. Aman Kumar, aged about 22 years, Male, S/o Surendra Prasad Singh, R/o Village- Dewadha, P.S.- Pakribarawan, District- Nawada.
2. Futus, aged about 22 years, S/o Nathu Singh, R/o Village- Dewadha, P.S.- Pakribarawan, District- Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Amresh Kumar Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Kumar Ranjit Ranjan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

4 05-06-2020 Heard Mr. Amresh Kumar Sinha, the learned counsel
for the petitioners and Mr. Kumar Ranjit Ranjan, the learned
Additional P.P. on the bail petition through video conferencing.

The petitioners seek bail in Pakribarawan P.S. Case
No.314 of 2019, registered under Section 395 of the Indian
Penal Code.

The informant alleged that on 02.10.2019 while he
was going on his motorcycle to deposit the money in LIC and
when he reached near village Dhevdha, 10-12 persons stopped
his motorcycle and began to demand *Chanda*. When the
informant showed his inability to pay *Chanda*, all the accused
persons snatched his back containing Rs.1,30,000/-. The



informant named the petitioners and others on the basis of the fact that the accused persons were calling their names.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have in fact committed no offence. The petitioners are students and they have falsely been implicated in the case. The informant was well acquainted with the petitioners from before and on account of some enmity, the petitioners have been implicated in the case. It is further submitted that an LIC agent is not authorized to carry money and collect cash from the insurer in order to deposit in LIC office and, therefore, the story of carrying money by the informant is false and concocted but it appears from perusal of the FIR and the case diary that besides the informant all other witnesses have supported the case that while the informant was passing through, the petitioners and others got him stopped and snatched his bag. The petitioners were duly identified in TIP.

Taking into consideration the facts, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioners is rejected.

The trial court is directed to hold the trial on day to day basis and conclude the same within four months from the date of receipt of this order.



If the trial is not concluded within four months, the
petitioners may renew their prayer for bail.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

S.KUMAR/-

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

