

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.58906 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-516 Year-2023 Thana- KATIHAR NAGAR District- Katihar

Amit Kumar Sharma @ Laloo Sharma @ Amit Sharma Son of Binod Sharma
Resident of Village - Bhagwabari, P.S. - Town, District - Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajendra Prasad Sah, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 04-09-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Nagar P.S. Case No. 516 of 2023, lodged on 10.07.2023, under Sections 399, 402, 413 and 414 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 25(1-b)a/26/35 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the bail application of the petitioner was earlier allowed vide order dated 07.02.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 5431 of 2024. Counsel submits that in the said bail application there were in total seven criminal antecedents known to the *parivikar* of the petitioner. As such, he had disclosed in the



earlier bail application that there are seven criminal cases pending against the petitioner. In the case diary, it has come that there are total sixteen (16) criminal cases pending against the petitioner and, therefore, bail was granted directing the trial Court to verify that if it has been found that there are sixteen (16) criminal antecedents of the petitioner then petitioner shall not be released on bail but if it has been found that there are seven criminal cases pending against him then the petitioner shall be released on bail immediately. Counsel submits that with this order when bail application was made to the trial Court then upon verification it transpired that there are in total 16 criminal cases pending against the petitioner. As such, the trial Court has not released the petitioner on bail and, thereafter, the petitioner has filed the present fresh bail application before this Hon'ble Court.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the petitioner had pleaded before this Hon'ble Court that it was due to miss-communication by the *pairvikar* of the case the entire situation has arisen but this point has not been mentioned anywhere in the



pleadings.

5. Only on this ground that the petitioner has tried to mislead this Court, this Court is not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same as early as possible.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Aman Kumar/-

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

