

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.73232 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-298 Year-2018 Thana- AMAS District- Gaya

SUJEET KUMAR @ GOLU Son of Vinod Thakur Resident of Village -
Chandpur (Kajratar), P.S.- Roshanganj, Distt.- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Natraj Verma, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 18-09-2020 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and
the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Amas P.S. Case No. 298 of 2018 dated 22.12.2018
instituted for the offences under Sections 302, 201,
120B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of
the Arms Act.

It has been submitted on behalf of the
petitioner that the FIR is against unknown and the name
of the petitioner has transpired in the confession of
some of the arrested accused persons. The petitioner is
also said to have confessed his guilt but the petitioner
denies that such statement was voluntarily given.

Apart from this, the implication of the petitioner
in this case is only on the basis of CDR. There is no eye



witness to the occurrence and the case hinges on circumstantial evidence which is not complete.

The petitioner is in custody since 23.04.2019.

This Court had asked for a report about the stage of the case on the earlier occasion. The report has since been received which indicates that the case has only been committed to the court of Sessions.

Regard being had to the nature of accusation against the petitioner, period of custody and that there has not been any substantial progress in the trial, the petitioner is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sherghati, Gaya in connection with Amas P.S. Case No. 298 of 2018.

However, the petitioner would be under an obligation to participate in the trial and his unauthorized absence from the trial proceedings for two consecutive occasions would render the bail granted to him liable to be cancelled.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

krishna/-

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

