

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-157 Year-2019 Thana- MAHUA District- Vaishali

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-157 Year-2019 Thana- MAHUA District- Vaishali

Sanjeet Kumar Jha @ Monu Jha S/O- Pramod Jha R/O- Village- Morwa Dih,
P.S.- Musrighrari, Dist.- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Surya Roy

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rajiv Nayan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 31-08-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 394, 302/34, 396, 397 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant and he is in custody since 21.09.2020 and charge-sheet has been submitted.

4. It is further submitted that the name of the petitioner transpired in the case based on confessional statement of Sonu but then Sonu has been acquitted by the learned Trial Court as would manifest from *Annexure-3* to the Supplementary



Affidavit. It is further submitted that the case of the petitioner was separated from other accused and petitioner is in custody since 21.09.2020.

5. The learned APP Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, vehemently opposes the instant bail application and submits that if the trial was separated that amply demonstrates that petitioner must be absconding on account of which the accused who were apprehended earlier their cases were separated from the case of the petitioner. It is also submitted that though it has been submitted that petitioner was implicated in the case based on confessional statement of Sonu, but, then from perusal of the order dated 17.01.2022 in Cr. Misc. No. 30015 of 2021, it would manifest that the petitioner was captured in the CCTV footage and was seen firing and that was the reason why the bail application of the petitioner was rejected.

6. Considering the submission made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

8. However, the learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and to conclude the same during the period of 18 months from the date of this order, if possible.



9. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the
learned Trial Court.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

