

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67606 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-243 Year-2019 Thana- SHEOHAR District- Sheohar

NAGENDRA MAHTO S/o Ram Kishun Mahto R/o Village- Daulatpur
Chandi, P.s.- Hajipur Sadar, District- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rina Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dinesh Singh

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER**

3 04-07-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the state.

Let the defect(s), if any, as pointed out by the office be removed within four weeks from the date of resumption of physical filing and physical removal of defect.

In the present case, the petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sheohar P.S. Case No. 243 of 2019 registered for the alleged offences under Section 395 of the Indian Penal Code.

The prosecution case is that six miscreants committed *dacoity* in the branch of UCO Bank, Sheohar and looted cash for an amount of Rs. 32,33,760/-. During investigation, the name of the petitioner came up as one of the accused persons.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR and nothing



incriminating has been recovered from his possession. Only on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused person, the petitioner has been named in this case. The co-accused who named this petitioner, has been granted bail by the learned court below. Till date the petitioner has not been put to TIP but charge sheet has been submitted without any substantive piece of evidence. The petitioner is in custody since 13.06.2020.

Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submitting that the petitioner is habitual offender and 19 cases are pending against him.

Having regard to the submissions made hereinabove and considering the nature of allegation against the petitioner and his involvement in large number of cases which are serious in nature, I am not persuaded to grant him bail at this stage.

Accordingly, his prayer for grant of bail is rejected.

The Trial Court is directed to conclude the trial expeditiously preferably within a period of six months.

However, if the trial is not concluded within the aforesaid period of six months, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

Gautam/-

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



