

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38204 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-85 Year-2022 Thana- JHAJHA District- Jamui

=====

Karan Sharma @ Ajay Sharma Son Of Late Hansraj Sharma Resident Of
Village - Wz 164, Gali No.2, Srinagar Delhi, P.S.- Subhash Palace, Distt.-
North West Delhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Satya Prakash Parasar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.A.G.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

5 03-01-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State.

The petitioner has filed the instant application for
grant of regular bail in a case registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 15(2), 15(4) of the Petroleum &
Mineral Pipeline Act, Section 3 and 4 of the Explosive
Substance Act and Sections 3 and 4 of the Prevention Of
Damage of Public Property Act.

The prosecution case in nutshell is that on
12.03.2022 at 1:00 AM, pressure was dropped at Barauni
control room in the Paradeep-Haldia-Barauni Pipeline. On
checking it was found that petitioner along with other co-



accused persons, with a lorry bearing registration No. NL-01AD-3328 and a white coloured bolero jeep without registration No., are involved in the theft of crude petroleum. It is further alleged that petitioner and co-accused persons had made a pit there and by using valve, committed theft of about 18 KL of crude oil.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is also submitted that petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 13.03.2022. It is further submitted that there is general and omnibus allegation levelled against the petitioner. The petitioner has no concern with the vehicles in question.

Learned APP appearing for the State and learned counsel for the informant has vehemently opposed the prayer for Bail and submitted that the petitioner is named in FIR with specific allegations. It is also submitted that In Para 8,9,and 20 of the Case Diary, witnesses has supported the prosecution version of the case and para 12 and 13 contain the confessional statement of the petitioner and



other co-accused persons.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of allegation, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and, as such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.

Learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same within a period of six months.

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

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

nirajkrs/-

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

