

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14565 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-16 Year-2019 Thana- MAHINDWARA District- Sitamarhi

PREM KUMAR SINGH @ TIGER @ PREM SINGH TIGER Son of Sri
Yugal Kishore Singh Resident of Village - Bhadai, P.S.- Hathauri, Distt -
Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Pushpendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nawal Kishore Prasad, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

10 29-01-2021 Heard Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, learned senior
counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Nawal Kishore Prasad,
learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Mahindwara P.S. Case No. 16 of 2019 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 384 and 385 of the Indian
Penal Code 1860.

The allegation as per the First Information Report is
that the informant received call on his Mobile demanding
extortion money and the caller threatened the informant that if
the demand would not be fulfilled, the informant and his entire
family members shall be finished. It has further been alleged
that the caller disclosed his name as Prem Singh Tiger i.e.



petitioner herein.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case and he has not committed any offence in the manner alleged. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner was in custody on the date of occurrence in connection with some other case and it was not possible to use the mobile from jail. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioner is in custody since 02.03.2019.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State submits that during course of investigation, it came to light that the Mobile number from which the extortion money was demanded, was registered in the name of another co-accused Mukesh Kumar and from CDR location, it appears that the call which was made to the informant was traced at Sitamarhi jail where the petitioner was kept.

This Court vide order dated 10.11.2020 had called for status report regarding stage of trial and in pursuance thereof, the report has been furnished vide letter No. 18 dated 27.11.2020 stating therein that trial is likely to be concluded within six months.

Having regard to the submissions made by the parties



and taking into consideration the materials on record, the nature of allegation and the fact that petitioner has criminal antecedents, I am not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner at this stage.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

However, if the trial does not show any progress, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after six months.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

S.Ali/-

U			
---	--	--	--

