

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40862 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-44 Year-2017 Thana- PARASBIGHA District- Jehanabad

VIKRAM @ SONU S/o Dinesh Prasad @ Dinesh Kumar R/o village-
Imadpur, P.S.- Bihar, District- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Mishra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Humayou Ahmad Khan, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER**

2 19-01-2022 Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner and learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

Let the defect(s) be removed within two weeks of the
complete start of the physical Court in normal course.

Petitioner who is in custody since 25.03.2021 seeks
regular bail in connection with Parasbigha P.S. Case No. 44 of
2017 registered for offence punishable under Section 392 of the
Indian Penal Code later on under Section 395 and 412 of the
Indian Penal Code.

Prosecution case in brief is that on 19.04.2017 at
about 10.00 hours, while the informant reached near *Mai* Halt,
one Bolero overtook and stopped in front of his vehicle and 3-4
accused persons looted cash, mobile etc. from the possession of



the informant and also took away his pick-up van bearing Registration No. BR-028582.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not been named in the F.I.R and the F.I.R. has been lodged against the unknown persons. The name of the petitioner has surfaced on the basis of confessional statement of one co-accused Prem Kumar @ Manoj Kumar in course of investigation. Charge-sheet has already been submitted. However, the investigation is pending against the non FIR co-accused persons. He further submits that petitioner is innocent and he is in custody since 25.03.2021.

Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case as well as there is no allegation of tampering the evidence or influencing the witness against the petitioner, the petitioner above named is directed to be enlarged to bail upon furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jehanabad/concern Court in connection with Parasbigha P.S. Case No. 44 of 2017 subject to the following conditions:

(i) Bailors should be local having sufficient



immovable property within the jurisdiction of the court concerned.

(ii) Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court.

(iii) If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses of the case, in that case, prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Niraj/-

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

