

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10048 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-860 Year-2023 Thana- PATRAKARNAGAR District- Patna

Prince Kumar Son of Late Shankar Yadav Resident of village Parbelia Ps
Neturia District Purulia west Bengal

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Priyanka Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dr. Ajeet Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 16-04-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Patrakar Nagar P.S. Case No. 860 of 2023 registered on
22.11.2023 lodged under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 419/34 of
the I.P.C.

3. As per the prosecution case, F.I.R. has been lodged
against two named accused persons including the petitioner with
allegation that there is recovery of 26 ATM Cards, six different
mobile phones and seven blank cheques from the possession of
the petitioner.

4. Counsel further submits that petitioner is innocent
and has committed no offence. He further submits that petitioner
is in custody since 22.11.2023 having no criminal case pending



against him. He submits that petitioner is student and nothing has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. From the content of F.I.R. itself, it is clear that the petitioner was caught and handed over to the police. In the F.I.R., the allegations made against the petitioner are without any basis.

5. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that huge amount of money, 26 ATM cards, various blank cheque and several mobile phones have been recovered for which petitioner has no documents. He further submits that on earlier occasion, case diary has been called for and upon perusal of the case diary, it transpires that the independent witnesses have been examined under Section 161 of the Cr.P.C. who has narrated and supported the F.I.R.

6. Upon specific query made by this Court that whether charge has been framed or not, counsel for the petitioner submits that he is not aware of this fact that charge has been framed or not.

7. In the present facts and circumstances of this case, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the bail application of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

8. However, petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer



for bail three months after framing of charge.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Sunnykr/-

U			
---	--	--	--

