

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10993 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-258 Year-2019 Thana- SONO District- Jamui

Chandan Burnwal Son of Ashok Burnwal @ Ashok Modi, resident of village -
Lakhankiyari, P.S.- Sono, District - Jamui.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pankaj Kumar Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Sharma

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 26-06-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State, Mr. Binod Kumar No.3 through Video
Conferencing.

In this case, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in
connection with Sono P.S. Case No. 258 of 2019 registered for
offence punishable under section 392 of the Indian Penal Code
and section 27 of the Arms Act.

As per allegation made in the FIR is that on the fateful
day, the informant had gone to withdraw the money and when
he was coming back on his splendor plus motor cycle bearing
No.BR-53C/1854, he was intercepted by three persons and they
took away his bag containing Rs.9,70,000/-. During
investigation, the police has raided the house of the present
petitioner and recovered Rs.10,000/- along with other



incriminating materials such as one Mobile, Aadhar Card and Pass Book of the informant from there.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance on para 68 and para 70 and has stated that in para 68, the spy has given the name of Dinesh Das, Mukesh Das, Vikash Das and in para 70, he has given the name of Dinesh Das, Mukesh Das, Vikash Das, Banti Das and Pawan Das but the name of the petitioner has not been taken by the spy. He further submits that Banti Das has been granted bail. Mukesh Das and Dinesh Das whose names have been taken by the spy, have also been granted bail by the court below, but from the possession of the petitioner, Rs.10,000/-, Mobile, Aadhar Card and Pass Book of the informant has been recovered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has been trapped in the present case, as there is a rivalry of business and on that account the informant in connivance with the police got the house of the petitioner raided and made alleged recovery from there.

Looking to the entire facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner for the present and accordingly his prayer for grant of bail is rejected. However, he may renew his prayer for bail after seven



months from today.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

Mahesh/-

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

