

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.55688 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-208 Year-2017 Thana- MAJORGANJ District- Sitamarhi

CHIRANJIVI SAGAR, SON OF LATE VINDESHWAR BHAGAT R/O
VILLAGE- HAJPURWA, P.S.- MAHINDWARA, DISTRICT- SITAMARHI

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Mishra

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Dr. Indihar Kumari

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 19-05-2022 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

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

The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Mejorganj P. S. Case No. 208 of 2017 for the offences
punishable under Sections 385, 387 and 34 of the Indian Penal
Code.

The prosecution story, in brief, is that the petitioner,
while in custody, has demanded ransom from one Krishan
Mohan Kumar Bajaj who was an owner of a medicine shop at
Dhang.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



there cannot be any question of demanding extortion money from the jail premises. The mobile phone from which the extortion was demanded was not registered in the name of the petitioner nor it is expected that he can possess mobile in the jail. The petitioner has remained in custody since 09.11.2020. He further submits that altogether 27 cases are pending against the petitioner. Among those 27 cases, the petitioner is on bail in 10 cases; remaining 16 cases are pending; and in one case, bearing Runni Saidpur P. S. Case No. 195 of 2012, he has been convicted. In the present case, petitioner has been made accused on mere suspicion and the allegation made in the F.I.R. cannot sustain because the petitioner in no manner is connected with the alleged demand of ransom.

Dr. Indihar Kumari, learned counsel for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail. She submits that the petitioner is convicted in one case and 16 cases are pending against him. There is every likelihood that the petitioner will indulge in influencing the witnesses or witnesses will be terrorized and he may also tamper the evidence. It will not be proper in the interest of the society as well as the public at large to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation made



against the petitioner and the long line of criminal cases pending against him, it would not be proper to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage.

Accordingly, the present bail application is rejected.

The trial court is directed to conclude the trial expeditiously.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

skm/-

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

