

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.61961 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-105 Year-2021 Thana- ARA MUFFSIL District- Bhojpur

ARYAN RAJ @ RAHUL KUMAR S/O SUNIL SINGH R/o village-
Gausganj, P.S.- Ara Town, District- Bhojpur at Ara.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Surj Bansh Roy
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh

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

3 17-05-2022 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

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

The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Muffasil P.S. Case No. 105 of 2021, for the offence punishable
under Sections 324, 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code and
Section 27 of the Arms Act later on Section 302 of the Indian
Penal Code has been added.

The prosecution story, in brief, is that five unknown
miscreants entered into the Punjab National Bank, Piraunta and
committed dacoity. On resistance, one of the miscreants resorted
to fire, which hit another miscreant resulting in his subsequent
death.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner



submits that for the same incident, three F.I.Rs have been lodged one by bank Manager bearing Ara Muffasil P.S. Case No. 103 of 2021 for the offence punishable under Section 395 of Indian Penal Code another by Police officer bearing Ara Muffasil P.S. Case No. 104 of 2021 for the offence punishable under Section 25(1-b)a, 26 and 35 of the Arms Act and the present F.I.R. in which the petitioner has been made accused recorded on the basis of fardbeyan recorded by the Dafadar bearing Ara Muffasil P.S. Case No. 105 of 2021 for the offence punishable under Section 324, 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act later on Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code has been added. It is submitted on behalf of petitioner that one co-accused Nitish Kumar Singh @ Golu Singh @ Nithish Kumar Singh against whom also in course of investigation came that he was one of the miscreants and allegation against the petitioner is also similar in nature that he along with other miscreants had looted money from the bank. There is no eye-witness of the occurrence, at best, the case is made out against the petitioner under Section 395 of I.P.C. for which F.I.R. was already lodged being Ara Muffasil P.S. Case No. 103 of 2021 in which he has already been released on bail vide order dated 10.03.2022 passed in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 44873 of 2021 other co-



accused have also been granted bail. So far as the present F.I.R. is concerned, the petitioner has been made accused in the present case merely on suspicion. The Chargesheet has already been submitted. The petitioner is in custody since 26.07.2021.

Learned A.P.P. for the State has opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that petitioner has confessed his guilt and in paragraph No. 36 of the case diary, the evidence has come to that effect. The petitioner has criminal antecedent and it would not be proper to enlarge the petitioner on bail as he will become nuisance to the society.

Considering the aforementioned facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner has been made accused in the present case on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused Amit Kumar @ Vicky, who has already been released on bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 18.04.2022 passed in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 67549 of 2021. Prima facie, the petitioner has made out a case to be released on bail, the petitioner, above named, is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25000/- (Rs. Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bhojpur in connection with Ara Muffasil P.S. Case No. 105 of



2021, subject to the following conditions:-

(1) Bailors should be local having sufficient immovable property within the jurisdiction of the Court concerned.

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

(3) 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.

(4) If the petitioner is found involved in similar nature of offence, after his release on bail, the trial Court shall take steps to cancel his bail bonds.

(5) The court below is directed to verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and if it is found that the petitioner is involved in some other cases as what has been stated in paragraph No.3 of the bail application, this order will automatically loose its force.

(6) The petitioner will make his attendance before the concerned Police Station under which his house is located every fortnight till conclusion of the trial and on any single default without any valid reasons on the part of the petitioner, his bail bonds shall be cancelled and the



**concerned SHO of the Police Station shall submit his
monthly attendance report to the Superintendent of Police
having jurisdiction.**

(Purnendu Singh, J)

manish/-

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

