

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 51036 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-331 Year-2021 Thana- KUMAR KHAND District- Madhepura

Ravikant Kumar @ Raja S/O Ratnesh Kumar Yadav Resident of village-
Shivnagar Parariya, Ward No- 3, P.S.- Kumarkhand, District- Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 34802 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-331 Year-2021 Thana- KUMAR KHAND District- Madhepura

Sumit Kumar @ Amit Kumar Son Of Sri Pramod Yadav R/O Village-
Shivnagar, Jamuwaha, Ward No.-4, P.S.- Kumarkhand, District- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 51036 of 2022)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Barun Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nagendra Prasad, APP

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 34802 of 2022)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Alok Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anand Mohan Prasad Mehta, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 24-12-2022 Let the defect(s), if any, be removed within two weeks
from today.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.Ps. for the State.

The petitioners seek regular bail in connection with
Kumarkhand P.S. Case No. 331 of 2021 lodged under Sections

392/34 of the I.P.C. and subsequently Sections 395/412 was also added.

As per the prosecution case, the allegation of robbery of Rs. 6,14,963/- has been made from the North Bihar Gramin Bank, Rauta Branch as well as the allegation of snatching the mobile of the Branch Manager who is the informant of the case is there.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the petitioners are not named in the F.I.R. Counsel submits that their names have figured in this case by virtue of the confessional statement made by Gautam Kumar and Randhir Kumar from whose possession, the part of the alleged looted money were also recovered alongwith the mobile set. Counsel for petitioners submit that there are 3 criminal cases pending against the petitioners and in all the cases they are on bail. Counsel submits that petitioners are in custody since 16.02.2022 and charge sheet has already been filed in this case. Counsel further submits that the other co-accused person, namely, Gautam Kumar has been granted bail by the District Court itself, whereas the other co-accused person, namely, Randhir Kumar has been granted bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 21.09.2022 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 13204 of 2022.

Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that there are 4 unknown accused persons against whom the case has been filed. Two were granted bail and two are present before the Court. Counsel submits that petitioners may be granted bail only after framing of charge with a view to secure the trial.

In the present facts and circumstances of these cases and the submissions made above, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present but liberty is hereby granted that they may renew their prayer for bail after framing of charge and the Trial Court is directed to release them on bail imposing its own conditions so that they may not evade their appearance during trial.

With this observation, the bail application stands rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

sadique/-

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