

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53921 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-324 Year-2018 Thana- SAHPUR District- Patna

VIJENDRA RAI @ BIJENDRA KUMAR Son of Late Dev Sakal Ray
Resident of Village-Noorpur Chandmari, P.O.-Chandmari, P.S.-Shahpur,
District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jai Vardhan Narayan
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Yogendra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

8 08-01-2020 The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Sahpur P.S. Case No. 324 of 2018, registered for offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 341, 323, 504, 384, 506 and 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

As per F.I.R., it is alleged that informant had a talk with the petitioner, who is a broker for purchase of a piece of land and the petitioner and one co-accused Pintu Kumar received Sixty Eight Lakhs from him but in spite of that they did not execute the sale deed. It is further alleged that on the plea of returning the amount, petitioner called the informant and took the agreement paper and tore the same.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that aforesaid allegation has no basis as the informant has no paper to show the agreement between the parties. It has also been submitted



that for the amount, which the petitioner alleged to have taken from him, one sale deed has already been executed for more than the amount and he has also filed a money suit for recovery of excess amount paid to him.

Heard learned A.P.P. as well as learned counsel for the informant. They have opposed the prayer for bail. Learned counsel for the informant has submitted that the intention of the petitioner to grab the amount is evident from the fact that he called the informant to return the amount and forcibly taken the agreement paper and tore the same and not returning the huge amount of the informant.

Having heard both sides, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

However, since the petitioner is in custody, learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and both the parties are directed to cooperate in expeditious disposal of trial.

This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

sunilkumar/-

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

