

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19378 of 2020**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-225 Year-2010 Thana- LAXMIPUR District- Jamui

=====

TANTAN MISHRA Son of Parmanand Mishra Resident of Karngarh, P.S.-
Laxmipur, District – Jamui. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Praveen Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Humayun Ahmad Khan

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER**

2 09-06-2020 This case has been heard through video-conferencing.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offence punishable under Section 395 of the Indian Penal Code.

While the informant along with other persons was returning to his house on his newly purchased motorcycle, at Laxmipur forest some unknown miscreants stopped them and looted his vehicle and also looted cash and mobile phone from them.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has no concern with the aforesaid occurrence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is neither named in the F.I.R. nor he was apprehended on the spot. There is nothing in the record indicating the complicity of the



petitioner in the occurrence barring the confessional statement made by co-accused before the police, which has no evidentiary value in the eye of law. The petitioner has been languishing in custody since 01.10.2018.

Learned APP for the State vehemently opposing the bail petition submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender. There are numerous cases registered against him. He had escaped from the custody while he was being produced before the learned Court below. Hence, considering the conduct of the petitioner, he does not deserve bail.

Considering the antecedent of the petitioner that several criminal cases are pending against him as also the fact that petitioner had absconded from the Jail Hazat, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The prayer for bail is hereby rejected.

However, the learned Trial Court is directed to conclude the trial as expeditiously as possible, preferably within one year and six months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order. Both the parties are expected to extend their co-operation in conclusion of the trial.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Trivedi/-

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

