IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 9752 of 2020

Matloob Ansari @ Matlub Ansari
… Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand … Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rohit Ranjan Sinha, Advocate
: Mr. Pankaj Srivastava, Advocate
For the State : Mrs. Ruby Pandey, Addl. P.P.

Order No.02 Dated- 15.12.2020

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Learned counsel for the petitioner personally undertakes to remove the defects as pointed out by the stamp reporter within two weeks after the lockdown period is over.

In view of the personal undertaking of the learned counsel for the petitioner, the defects pointed out by the stamp reporter are ignored for the present.

The petitioner has moved this Court for grant of bail in connection with Ketar P.S. Case No.68 of 2020 registered under sections 395/397 of the Indian Penal Code.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner along with the co-accused persons committed dacoity and caused hurt to the victim and looted mobile phone and cash. It is further alleged that the looted mobile phone was recovered from the possession of the petitioner and in the T.I. Parade, the petitioner has been identified. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false and this is not a case of dacoity rather this is a case of road accident. It is then submitted that there is a delay in lodging of the F.I.R. and the petitioner sustained severe injury and he was in hospital. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

The learned Addl. P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that besides the petitioner being identified in the T.I. Parade, the looted mobile phone has been

recovered from the possession of the petitioner which has also been identified in the T.I. Parade of articles, hence there is every chance of the petitioner absconding, if released on bail. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not be admitted to bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner of commission of dacoity, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the above named petitioner be admitted to bail. Accordingly, the prayer for regular bail of the above named petitioner is rejected.

Keeping in view the period of custody undergone by the petitioner and the serious nature of offences involved in this case, notwithstanding any order in administrative side of this Court, the trial court is directed to take up the trial of the case expeditiously and to conclude the trial within six months from the date of receipt of this order by the trial court. It is made clear that the trial be conducted and witnesses be examined by observing the precautions relating to COVID -19 Pandemic.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Sonu-Gunjan/