

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.71263 of 2023

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

Pintu Kumar Yadav Son Of Bhimlal Yadav Resident Of Village - Rambagh
Yadavtola Machhaila, P.S. - Malalgaon, District - Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vaishnavi Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dinesh Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

3 11-12-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Jokihat P.S. Case No. 295 of 2023 instituted for the offence under Sections 395, 397 & 412 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, some unknown miscreants are said to have intercepted the informant and looted away cash of Rs. 23,51,400/- from him.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and committed no offence. He is not named in the FIR rather he has falsely been implicated in this case on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused persons. Thereafter, this petitioner was arrested. He has not been put on TI Parade till date. He has got no criminal antecedent as



stated in para-3 of the bail petition and languishing in judicial custody since 1.7.2023.

5. Learned APP appearing for the state has opposed the prayer of regular bail and submitted that the petitioner confessed his involvement in his self confessional statement with regard to loot of money from the informant. At his instance, 2 lakh cash was also recovered from his house which is said to be looted amount. It is also submitted that the bail petition of other co-accused Astasam was already rejected by a co-ordinate Bench of this court vide order dt. 17.10.2023 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 67196 of 2023.

6. 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.

7. However, the petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer for bail three months after framing of charge.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

Amandeep/-

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

