

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5855 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-238 Year-2021 Thana- SAHEBPUR KAMAL District-
Begusarai

=====

RAVI KUMAR SON OF KANGO YADAV @ RAJIV KUMAR RANJAN
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- HEERA TOL, P.S. SAHEBPUR KAMAL,
DISTRICT- BEGUSARAI

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ram Sumiran Rai

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anil Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 21-06-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the

State.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in Sahebpur Kamal P.S.

Case no. 238/2021 registered for the offence punishable under

Sections 401, 414, 477/34 of the Indian Penal Code and sections

25(1-b)a, 26, 35 of the Arms Act.

Allegedly, from the possession of this petitioner, a

loaded country made pistol and two mobile phones were

recovered and one of the mobile is said to have been looted

from the victim of Sahebpur Kamal P.S. Case no. 219/2021.

The main submissions advanced by the learned

counsel for the petitioner are that there are four cases against the

petitioner in which he is on bail except Sahebpur Kamal P.S.



Case no. 219/2021 and in this case, petitioner's name came to light in the confessional statement of co-accused and petitioner has been languishing in jail for the last nine months.

Learned APP opposes the prayer for bail.

I have heard both sides and perused the FIR. As per FIR during investigation in respect of Sahebpur Kamal P.S. Case no. 219/2021 lodged under section 392 IPC, one co-accused person Rupesh Kumar was taken into custody and on whose disclosure, looted mobile phone was recovered and later on, present petitioner was arrested and from his person, a loaded pistol and two mobile phones were recovered in which one is stated to be looted article and as per prosecution this petitioner and other co-accused persons indulged in the act of looting.

Considering the nature of the allegation as well as recovery of firearm and looted mobile from possession of the petitioner, this Court does not find it a fit case of bail at this stage and accordingly, his prayer for bail stands rejected.

Petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after framing of the charge, if the same has not been done till now.

(Shailendra Singh, J)

s.hassan/-

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

