

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31097 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-194 Year-2021 Thana- TAJPUR District- Samastipur

=====

Asha Devi Wife Of Suresh Singh Resident Of Sahdullapur Ward No.-6,
Chandan Patti P.S.-Sakara, District-Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Sharda Kumari, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

8 19-04-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Tajpur P.S. Case No. 194 of 2021, lodged on 19.05.2021, under
Sections 395/412/120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution, the FIR has been lodged
against seven unknown accused persons against whom
allegation of bank robbery has been made.

4. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. There are
two criminal cases pending against the petitioner in which she is
on bail. Counsel submits that petitioner is lady aged about 41



years and no incriminating article has been recovered from the physical or conscious possession of the petitioner in the present case. Name of the petitioner has figured in this case only due to the reason that name of her son has come in the cases relating to bank dacoity. Counsel submits that the petitioner is in custody since 20.06.2021 in another case, but in the present case she was remanded on 29.04.2022 and since then she is in judicial custody. Counsel submits that charge sheet has already been filed.

5. Learned counsel for State, on the other hand, opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the dacoity of Rs.7,90,590/- have been made and the photographs of all the dacoits have been captured in the CCTV footage. Counsel for State further submits that the antecedent of the petitioner is not clean. There are two more criminal cases pending against the petitioner and all are relating to Bank dacoity.

6. Upon the specific query of the Court that whether charge has been framed or not. Counsel for the petitioner submits that as per his knowledge charge has not been framed.

7. In the light of the peculiar facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner is



hereby rejected. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to
renew the prayer for bail three months after framing of the
charge.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Mkr./-

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

