

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67256 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-97 Year-2022 Thana- JANTA BAZAR District- Saran

MANU DUBEY Son of Basisth Dubey Resident of Village- Darhibari, P.S.-
Baniapur, District- Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Harsh Anuj, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Pushpa Sinha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 29-04-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Janta
Bazar P.S. Case No. 97 of 2022 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 383, 384, 387, 120B, 506 and 34
of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of four cases and is in custody
since 01.06.2022.

The informant alleges that his nephew received
call of extortion on his mobile, the caller demanded an
extortion of Rs. 3 Lakhs and when his nephew disclosed his



inability to pay then on 19.12.2021 the accused persons came at his medicine shop and started firing, for which an F.I.R was instituted against unknown, it is next alleged that again on 27.04.2022 two accused persons came at his shop and started firing and the occurrence was captured in the C.C.T.V. It is further alleged that on 29.04.2022 a call on the mobile of the informant came and the caller was demanding an extortion of Rs. 6 Lakhs failing which he will have to face dire consequences.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, it is next submitted that his name transpired based on suspicion. It is also submitted that petitioner was not captured in the footage of C.C.T.V and thus has been falsely implicated.

Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that though it is submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner was not captured in the C.C.T.V, but then the same is not pleaded in the bail application.

Considering the submission made by the learned



A.P.P, the Court, for the present, is not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

However, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail six months after framing of charge.

Accordingly, the present bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

