

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11441 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-193 Year-2021 Thana- KURSAKANTA District- Araria

Bhubnehwer @ Bhubneshwer Sah, Son of Anand Lal Sah, Resident Of
Village- Rangeli, Ward No.-4, P.S.- Rangeli, Distt- Morang (NEPAL)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nishant Kumar Sinha, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

2 04-07-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

Let the defect (s), as pointed out by the office, be removed within a period of four weeks from the date of resumption of physical filing and physical removal of defect.

In the present case, the petitioner seeks bail in connection with Kursakanta (Kuari O.P.) P.S. Case No. 193 of 2021 registered for the alleged offences under Sections 489 (A), 489(B), 489(C), 489(D) and 489(E) of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegedly, the petitioner was apprehended with fake currency notes and 40 such currency notes each valued Rs. 2,000/-, totaling an amount of Rs. 80,000/- has been recovered from the possession of this petitioner.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. He went at the place of occurrence as his sister is married in the said locality and went to buy sweets for children. The petitioner is in custody since 07.10.2021 and he is having clean antecedent.

Learned APP opposes the prayer for bail submitting that fake currency notes have been recovered from the possession of the petitioner.

Having regard to the submissions made hereinabove and considering the specific allegation against the petitioner for dealing with the fake currency notes which directly hits the economy of the State, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage.

Accordingly, his prayer for bail is rejected.

Learned trial court is directed to conclude the trial expeditiously preferably within a period of one year.

However, if trial is not concluded within one year, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.

V.K.Pandey/-

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

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

