

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
(FROM RESIDENTIAL OFFICE VIA VIDEO APPLICATION)
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12915 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-164 Year-2020 Thana- MUSAHARI District- Muzaffarpur

ANAND PANDEY Son of Rajeshwar Pandey Resident of Village - Teghra,
P.S. - Manjhi, District - Saran (Chapra/Chhapra).

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Setu Prateek, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dr.Ajeet Kumar, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER**

3 25-08-2021 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Dr. Ajeet Kumar, learned APP for the State.

The petitioner in the present case is seeking regular bail in connection with Mushahari P.S. Case No. 164 of 2020 registered for the offences punishable under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the prosecution story, on 16.09.2020 when the informant was at his shop two unknown persons came there and looted a sum of Rs. 3 lakhs and few thousand on the gunpoint. It is alleged that the accused persons threatened the informant to kill and the whole incident has been captured in the CCTV camera.

Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is submitted that nothing incriminating has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since

27.09.2020.

Learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case wherein the allegation against the petitioner is that of snatching away the bag containing a sum of Rs.30,000/- from the informant on the point of pistol and in course of investigation the informant has produced the CCTV footage and the petitioner has been identified in the CCTV footage, as also that the petitioner has got one criminal antecedent of similar nature, in the nature of the materials showing involvement of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail at this stage. The prayer for bail of the petitioner is, thus, refused.

Let the trial be expedited. If the trial is not concluded within a period of nine months for no reason attributable to the petitioner from the date of communication of this order, he may renew his prayer for bail.

The application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

SUSHMA2/-

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

Note: The ordersheet duly signed has been attached with the record. However, in view of the present arrangements, during Pandemic period all concerned shall act on the basis of the copy of the order uploaded on the High Court website under the heading 'Judicial Orders Passed During The Pandemic Period'.