

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.27732 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-456 Year-2023 Thana- RANIGANJ District- Araria

Manohar Yadav @Manohar Kumar Yadav SON OF BECHAN YADAV RESI-
DENT OF VILLAGE- BISHTORIA PS- RANIGANJ, DIST- ARARIA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Kishore Bharti, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umanath Mishra, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND
MALVIYA**

ORAL ORDER

2 19-04-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for an
offence punishable under Section 395 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, 6-7 miscreants came
on the motorcycle and they started to demand of key of the mo-
torcycle of the informant and starting assaulting on his head by
means of butt of pistol as a result of which, the informant fell
down and snatched a mobile and cash of Rs.3,000/-.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this
case and the name of the petitioner has transpired on the basis of
suspicion and he is in custody since 27.11.2023.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for
bail of the petitioner.



6. On perusal of the first information report, seizure list and impugned order dated 13.02.2024, it appears that specific allegation against the petitioner for committing the occurrence for an offence under Section 395 of the IPC and this incident occurred on 26.11.2023 and one looted Oppo mobile bearing IMEI no.86003506662805 and red colour Hero Xtreme motorcycle bearing registration no. BR-38Z5849 for using this occurrence as mentioned in the FIR and cash of Rs.3,000/- recovered from the pocket of the petitioner and petitioner is also having one criminal antecedent under the Arms Act, so considering all aspects of the material, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

8. However, the learned trial Court is directed to conclude the trial within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and if the trial is not concluded within the stipulated period, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail before the trial Court.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Brajesh Kumar/-

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

