

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20687 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-269 Year-2020 Thana- KARJA District- Muzaffarpur

CHINTU KUMAR S/o Pannalal @ Pyarelal R/o village- Amathuam, P.S.-
Karja, District- Muzaffarpur. At present R/o village- Amathua, P.S.- Kako,
District- Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gajendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Anurag Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

5 30-11-2021

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in a case registered under sections 386, 387, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

As per the prosecution case, it is stated by the informant that he received extortion call on his mobile phone and ultimately as a result of the fear and torture transferred a sum of Rs. 10,000/- to the account mentioned in the FIR.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. The mobile number from which the alleged call was made to the informant does not belong to the petitioner but belongs to Kishan Khan. It is further submitted that the brother of the petitioner is in custody and on being asked by him he had provided him his account number. He has no knowledge about the alleged occurrence. The petitioner is in custody since 2.11.2020 and it is lastly submitted that in all the four cases



which find mention in the letter dated 26.10.2021 of the Senior Superintendent of Police, Muzaffarpur, the petitioner has been remanded subsequent to the filing of the instant application. This fact has been stated in the supplementary affidavit filed on behalf of the petitioner.

The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State who submits that there is direct allegation by the informant in the FIR that he paid a sum of Rs. 10,000/- by google pay and it is not in dispute that the said amount was credited in the account of this petitioner.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts of the case, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.

Taking into consideration the allegations and the period in custody, liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail after six months.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Prakash/-

U			
---	--	--	--

