

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
(FROM RESIDENTIAL OFFICE VIA VIDEO APPLICATION)
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5619 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-395 Year-2019 Thana- LAHERIMUHALLA District- Nalanda

MUNNA VERMA @ ARYAN S/O SRI GOPAL VERMA RESIDENT OF
VILLAGE-SARMERA (MALI TOLA), P.S-SARMERA, DISTRICT-
NALANDA, AT PRESENT BANSFOR GALI, P.S-DEEPNAGAR,
DISTRICT-NALANDA.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mahendra Thakur, Advocate

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

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

2 16-04-2021 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.
Manoj Kumar, learned APP for the State.

The petitioner in the present case is seeking regular
bail in connection with Laheri P.S. Case No. 395 of 2019
registered for the offences punishable under Section 393 of the
Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is said to have been apprehended by the people while
he along with others went to commit dacoity in jewellery shop.

Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is innocent
and has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is
submitted that no incriminating material has been recovered
from the possession of the petitioner and on mere suspicion the



nearby people of the alleged place of occurrence caught the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 27.09.2019.

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, considering that the petitioner was caught by the people on the spot when he had gone with his friends to commit a dacoity in the jewellery shop, he has got criminal antecedents as well and in paragraph '3' it is stated that he is accused in 7 cases, one of them is under Section 302/34 IPC and 27 of the Arms Act and two cases are under Section 394 IPC and 392 IPC, considering the entirety of the circumstances, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage. The prayer for regular bail of the petitioner is, thus, refused.

If the trial is not concluded within a period of 9 months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.

The application stands disposed of.

(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'.

