

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33852 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-531 Year-2023 Thana- BARBIGHA District- Sheikhpura

Krishna Murari Son Of Jitendra Prasad Resident Of Village-Jalalpur, P.S-
Maranchi, District-Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Onkar Nath, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Tarun Prasad Mandal, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Bipin Kumar, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

4 02-08-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant, learned APP for the State and perused
the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in Barbigaha P.S. Case No.
531 of 2023, instituted for the offences punishable under
Section 395 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, the informant
is the Area manager of Ashirvad Micro Finance Ltd. and he is
posted at Akhorigola. It is alleged that some unknown persons
attacked his Branch and looted away gold, Cash of Rs.
2,11,245/- and other articles.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the



present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submitted that the petitioner along with other co-accused during course of investigation made confession in the commission of the offence and stated that the looted gold articles have been kept in the rented house and accordingly certain gold articles were recovered. The articles were recovered elsewhere but the investigating officer has shown that the said articles were recovered from the residence of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner lastly submitted that no T.I. parade has been conducted in this case. The petitioner is in custody since 22.12.2023 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned counsel for the informant also submitted that the trial is in progress and the robbed articles were recovered from the house of the petitioner. The petitioner has also confessed that he along with other co-accused persons had committed the robbery in the branch office at Barbigha. Hence, in view of the nature of allegation, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.



6. Considering the nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

