

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29012 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-15 Year-2020 Thana- KASBA District- Purnia

=====

MUSAHID ALAM S/o Muzahid Alam Resident of Village-Bahura, Badalgah,
P.S.-Amour, District-Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ram Prawesh Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Bilash Roy Raman APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

4 21-12-2020 As of now, the Courts have not resumed normal physical hearing. The matter has been listed today for consideration through Video Conferencing.

Learned counsel are appearing and making submissions from their residence. The Court master and Secretary are also part of this virtual Court proceedings with the aid of audio visual technology.

Mr.Ram Bilash Roy Raman learned APP, is appearing as it is submitted that the brief has been allotted to him by the office of Advocate General. His name may also be printed in the cause list.

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

Learned counsel for the petitioner is expected to honour



his undertaking given in the instant case for depositing the requisite court fee and to remove the defects as pointed out by office when called upon.

The petitioner seeks bail in Kasba P.S. Case no. 15 of 2020, instituted for the offence under Section 392 of the I.P.C.

Allegation is that three miscreants have intercepted the informant while he was moving on his motorcycle along with certain cash and other belongings. Two have got down from the motorcycle and taken away his belongings.

It is submitted by the petitioner's counsel that Md. Dilwar and Md. Ekram were examined in connection with Kasba P.S. Case No. 19 of 2020, wherein, they have named the petitioner leading to his implication. The petitioner has not been put on TIP and it is submitted that in other two cases, in which, petitioner was named by two other accused persons, is already on bail.

The learned APP has opposed the prayer for bail. Referring to the case diary, it is submitted that there is recovery of laptop and other articles looted from the informant from the petitioner's house. The said recovery is clear indication of the petitioner complicity in the crime and he is not entitled to grant of bail.



Considering the aforesaid, this Court, for the present, is not inclined to allow the petitioner's prayer. Prayer for bail is rejected.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

shyambihari/-

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

