

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
(FROM RESIDENTIAL OFFICE VIA VIDEO APPLICATION)
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26218 of 2020**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-31 Year-2020 Thana- SAMASTIPUR District- Samastipur

Indradev Taneja @ Jonny, Son of Late Chunnilal Taneja, Resident of Village-
Bangali Tola, P.S.- Samastipur Town, District- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pravin Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Renuka Ratnakar, A.P.P.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER**

5 21-12-2020 Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to remove all the defects as pointed out by office within four weeks after start of normal functioning of the Court.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Ms. Renuka Ratnakar, learned A.P.P. for the State.

Petitioner in the present case is seeking regular bail in connection with Samastipur Town P.S. Case No. 31 of 2020 registered for the offence under Sections 394, 411, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been involved in this case on mere suspicion, he has not been put on T.I.P. and there is no recovery from his possession. Learned counsel submits that the name of this



petitioner has transpired as an associate of co-accused Ajay Rai about whom it has come in the case diary that he was seen in the CCTV Footage.

It is submitted that in the two cases mentioned in paragraph '3' in which the petitioner is an accused he has been granted bail.

Ms. Renuka Ratnakar, learned A.P.P. for the State has opposed the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner. It is submitted that in course of investigation it has come that the mobiles of co-accused Ajay Rai, this petitioner and co-accused Shambhu Gupta were operating in the same location on the date of occurrence near the place of occurrence and they were talking to each other.

It is submitted that the connection of the petitioner with the co-accused are, thus, evident from the CDR of the mobiles.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the seriousness of the allegation and the materials which have come in course of investigation as also the criminal antecedent of similar nature of the petitioner and that the petitioner is in custody only since 04.02.2020, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of regular bail to the petitioner.



Prayer is refused.

Let the trial be expedited.

The trial court is expected to conclude the trial as early as possible preferably within a period of six months from today.

In case the trial is not concluded within a period of six months for no reason attributable to the petitioner, he may renew his prayer for bail.

The application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

vats/-

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

Note: The ordersheet duly signed has been attached with the record. However, in view of the present arrangements, during Pandemic period all concerned shall act on the basis of the copy of the order uploaded on the High Court website under the heading 'Judicial Orders Passed During The Pandemic Period'.

