

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31539 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-8 Year-2017 Thana- NIRMALI District- Supaul

=====

HANUMAN MAHTO Son of Late Rameshwar Mahto Resident of Village -
Nirmali Ward No. 6, P.S.- Nirmali, District - Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kamal Kishore Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Lakshmi Kant Sharma

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 02-12-2020 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

This application for regular bail arises out of Nirmali P.S. Case No. 08 of 2017, disclosing the offence punishable under Sections 392 of the Indian Penal Code.

FIR was registered against unknown. The allegation is of snatching of the informant's motorcycle, a mobile phone and cash by the miscreants at the point of country-made pistol. The informant was allegedly assaulted by them before his valuables were snatched by the miscreants. During course of investigation, name of the petitioner surfaced. The petitioner is said to have confessed his involvement in commission of the offence before the police. From the statement made in paragraph 3 of the application, it appears that the petitioner has following



criminal antecedent :-

- “(1) Nirmali P.S. Case No. 97 of 2016, offence under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code in which he has been granted bail.*
- (2) Nirmali P.S. Case No. 44 of 2010, offence under Section 414 of the Indian Penal Code in which he has been granted bail.*
- (3) Nirmali P.S. Case No. 96 of 2017, offence under Section 394 of the Indian Penal Code in which he has been granted bail.*
- (4) Nirmali P.S. Case No. 78 of 2017, offence under Section 379 of the Indian Penal Code, which is pending.*
- (5) Nirmali P.S. Case No. 79 of 2017, offence under Section 379 of the Indian Penal Code, which is pending.”*

Considering the petitioner’s involvement in so many cases of serious nature and the nature of accusation in the present case, I am not inclined to grant him privilege of regular bail for the present.

This application is accordingly rejected.

The petitioner shall be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after one year if, in the meanwhile, there is no substantial progress in the trial.

It is directed that defects in the application



pointed out by the Registry must be removed within two months from today.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

Rajesh/-

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

