

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28220 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-309 Year-2023 Thana- KARAKAT District- Rohtas

=====

Dharmraj Singh @ Guddu S/O Late Baban Singh Resident Of Village-
Aharawan, Police Station- Sasaram(M), District- Rohtas At Sasaram.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raghunandan Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anish Chandra, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 20-09-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offences punishable under Section 392 of the IPC in connection
with Karakat P.S. Case No.309 of 2023.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of five cases and is in custody since
31.01.2024 and the informant alleges that accused persons
including the petitioner looted his car.

4. The learned counsel submits that petitioner has
been falsely implicated in the instant case because of his
antecedent. It is also submitted that the car was recovered on the
same day itself.

5. The learned APP opposes the regular bail
application and submits that petitioner appears to be a hardened



criminal and is named in the FIR.

6. On query of the Court that as to whether charges have been framed or not, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that he has taken instruction yesterday and it has been informed that charges have been framed, on which the learned APP submits that since charges have been framed the trial has commenced.

7. Since the trial has commenced, as such the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail, however, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after the informant is examined in the trial, but if the informant is not examined within a period of six months from today, in that event also the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

8. Accordingly, the bail application is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Prakash Narayan

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

