

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2032 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-572 Year-2011 Thana- GAYA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Gaya

=====

Ravindra Sharma @ Ravindra Kumar Sharma Son of Late Bhikhari Mistri
Resident of Village - Dhogila, P.S.- Bankey Bazar, Distt - Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Karu Choudhary Son of Late Janaki Choudhary Resident of Village -
Bankey Bazar, P.S.- Bankey Bazar, Distt - Gaya.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kunwar Narayan Jamuar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Rina Sinha, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 25-02-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned A.P.P for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in **Complaint Case No. 572 of 2011**, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 323, 420, 504 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The complainant alleged that his son Shiv Kumar Choudhary had purchased Tata Magic Vehicle for Rs. 1,08,000/- only. He paid Rs. 80,000 by taking loan from a Finance Company and rest amount of Rs. 28,000/- was paid by the accused Satandeo Prajapati. A sale deed was executed by the accused Satandeo Prajapati in which he has mentioned that there is no arrear. Complainant's son was driving his vehicle. In the



meantime, Teni Mistri and Manoj Kumar snatched his vehicle because of arrear of vehicle and they kept his vehicle in garage. Thereafter, Finance company seized the aforesaid vehicle.

It is submitted that petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. Petitioner is said to be one of the witnesses of the sale deed which is executed by the co-accused Satandeo Prajapati and Shiv Kumar Chaudhary. Save and except there is nothing against this petitioner. Petitioner has got clean antecedent.

Considering the facts aforesaid, the petitioner above-named in the event of his arrest/surrender before the court below within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned **Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Sherghati, Gaya** in connection with **Complaint Case No. 572 of 2011**, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure with further conditions:-

(i) The petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by



the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the Court and in the event of failure on two consecutive dates without sufficient reasons, his bail bond shall be liable to be cancelled by the court below.

(ii) If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses of the case, in that case, prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

vinita/-

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

