

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86439 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-185 Year-2019 Thana- ROHTAS District- Rohtas

Ashok Sah Son of Sri Ramraj Sah Resident of Village - Hariharganj, P.S.-
Narsiganj, Distt – Rohtas. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Deovind Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Binod Kumar No.3, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 19-03-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

In this case, the petitioner is seeking bail in connection with Rohtas P.S. Case No. 185 of 2019 registered for offence punishable under Section 364 (A) of the Indian Penal Code.

An FIR has been lodged for kidnapping of father of the informant and a demand of Rs. 2 crores was made from two mobile phones, which has been mentioned in the FIR.

Though, in paragraph 3 of the bail petition, it has been stated that the petitioner has been made accused in Nasriganj P.S. Case No. 208 of 2017 registered under Section 364 (a) of the Indian Penal code and Sasaram (Tilauthu) P.S. Case No. 1517 of 2017 registered under Sections 25 (1-b) a, 26, 35 of the Arms Act, but from paragraph 133 of the case diary, it appears that he has also made an accused in Dehri Nagar P.S.



Case No. 348 of 2008 registered for the offence punishable under Section 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code, so he has a criminal history of heinous crime and the petitioner has suppressed this fact in the bail petition. At the same time, paragraph 129 of the case diary shows that he was talking terms with the other accused persons which is very much clear from perusal of paragraphs 166 and 167 of the case diary. It was verified from the forensic examination that it is the petitioner, who was making demand of ransom of Rs. 2 crores. In details, the transcription has been mentioned.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that two accused persons have already been granted bail and the petitioner is in jail custody since 14.08.2019.

But in view of the fact that the petitioner has suppressed about his criminal antecedents as well as the transcription itself shows that it is the petitioner who was demanded extortion money, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner for the present.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

V.K.Pandey/-

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

