

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 67196 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-295 Year-2023 Thana- JOKIHAT District- Araria

=====

AHTASAM @ MD. EHTASAM SON OF ZAKIR VILLAGE- BAGMARA,
WARD NO. 2, PS- JOKIHAT, DIST- ARARIA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Birendra Kumar, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Satya Nand Shukla, Adv

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 17-10-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State and counsel for the informant.

2. Counsel for the informant submits that he has filed Soft Copy of the Vakalatnama and due to lack of time, he is presenting the hard copy of Vakalatnama in this Court which is directed to be accepted.

3. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Jokihat P.S. Case No. 295 of 2023 registered on 19.06.2023 lodged under Sections 395, 397, 412 of the I.P.C.

4. As per the prosecution case, F.I.R. has been lodged with an allegation of committing loot of Rs. 23,51,400/- from the informant.

5. Counsel for the petitioner submits that name of the petitioner has figured in this case by virtue of confessional



statement of the co-accused namely Saddam. Counsel for the petitioner accepts that Rs. One Lakh has been recovered from the house of the petitioner but he submits that no T.I.P. of the said money has taken place.

6. Counsel further submits that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He further submits that petitioner is in custody since 01.07.2023 having clean antecedent.

7. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for bail.

8. Learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that it is a case of robbery in which total Rs. 23,51,400/- has been looted. The said Saddam is nonetheless the brother of the present petitioner. He submits that from the rejection order, it is clear that Rs. 2 lakh has been recovered from the house of other co-accused namely Mintu Kumar. He submits that there is clear cut involvement of the petitioner is committing loot.

7. In the present facts and circumstances of this case and the submissions made above, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the petitioner for regular bail stands rejected. However, petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer for



bail three months after framing of charge.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

sunnykr/-

U			
---	--	--	--

