

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.50009 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-487 Year-2015 Thana- BARH District- Patna

=====

SONU KUMAR @ SONU YADAV Son of Shankar Yadav Resident of
Village - Mehendi Bigaha, Police Station - Chandi, District - Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravi Shanker Pankaj
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Tarkeshwar Nath Thakur

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 01-02-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State through video conferencing.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Barh P. S.
Case No.487 of 2015, instituted for the offences under Section
395 of the Indian Penal Code.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is in custody since 21.02.2021, has antecedent of five
cases and charge-sheet has been submitted in the case.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
informant alleges that while informant was sleeping in the night,
when at 10.00 P.M. ten unknown criminals entered his house
and on the point of gun, looted the household articles including
the jewellery, mobiles, torch etc. worth Rs.1,50,000/-.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



F.I.R. was against unknown and the petitioner was made to confess his crime when he came to be arrested in Barh P. S. Case No.488 of 2015.

The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that during the course of investigation one co-accused Shankar Ravi Das was arrested and he in his confessional statement stated that he along with petitioner had looted a motorcycle for which Barh P. S. Case No.486 of 2015 was instituted and on the date of occurrence in the present case, the petitioner had gone to Fatuha and he looted the house of the informant. The learned counsel submits that even the co-accused, who accepted that he committed the occurrence has very clearly stated that petitioner was not present when the occurrence had taken place, but still petitioner has been implicated.

The learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the bail application.

Considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody and charge-sheet has been submitted in the case, the petitioner, above-named, is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate,



Barh, Patna in connection with Barh P. S. Case No.487 of 2015, subject to condition that one of the bailors shall be the father of the petitioner namely, Shankar Yadav and the petitioner will have to mark his attendance before the concerned police station in between 25th to 30th of every month commencing from February, 2022, till the charges are not framed. In the event, the concerned police station reports to the learned Court below that petitioner has violated the condition imposed as aforesaid in any of the month before framing of charge, the learned Court below will be at liberty to cancel his bail bonds.

The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

