

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23077 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-191 Year-2023 Thana- ARWAL District- Jehanabad

=====

Hari Shankar Singh S/o Late Yamuna Singh R/O Village- Khanani Kala, P.S-
Agiaon Bazar, Piro, Distt.- Bhojpur (ARA).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Shri Amrendra Kumar Shrivastava, District Manager, State Food Corporation Arwal Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Abhay Shanker Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, Adv.
	Mr. Utkarsh Utpal, Adv.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

3 04-07-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with

Arwal P.S. Case No. 191 of 2023 registered for the offence

punishable under Sections- 409, 420, 120B of the Indian

Penal Code.

3. The F.I.R. has been lodged on the basis of

typed application of Amrendra Kumar Srivastava, the

District Manager of F.C.I., Arwal. As per allegation, the

contractual appointment of the petitioner was made on the

post of Assistant Godown Manager on 03.03.2023. A

physical verification of the godown was conducted. At the

time of physical verification, the petitioner failed to submit



the stock register, for which, he was show caused. Without any explanation, he became absent. On physical verification, a huge shortage of the food grains was detected.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in this case. He has got no criminal antecedent. He has further submitted that prior to this occurrence, this petitioner made complaint against the informant of inflicting tortures upon him. It has also been submitted that the petitioner is an old man.

5. On the other hand, Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, learned counsel appearing for the B.S.F.C. has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that it has nowhere been mentioned as to whom, the written complaint against the informant was sent. He has next submitted that the petitioner is custodian of the godown, in question. There was a huge shortage of foodgrains, to which, he is responsible.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, presently, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.



7. The Trial Court is directed to conclude the trial within a period of one year.

8. However, if so advised, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail, if the trial is not concluded within the stipulated period of one year.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

A.K.V.//-

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

