

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.70027 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-520 Year-2022 Thana- SAHARSA SADAR District- Saharsa

Ritik Kumar @ Ritik Roshan Son of Sri Pramod Kumar Bhagat @ Pramod
Bhagat Resident of Mohalla- Hatiya Gachhi, PS -Saharsa, District -Saharsa
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Santosh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr.Choubey Jawahar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

2 05-10-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. This is the second attempt for bail of the petitioner
as earlier such prayer was rejected by order dated 22.02.2024 in
Cr. Misc. No. 8355 of 2024.

3. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Saharsa Sadar P.S. Case No. 520 of 2022 registered for the
offence punishable under Sections 489A, 489B and 120B of the
Indian Penal Code.

4. The following order was passed on 22.02.2024 in
Cr. Misc. No. 8355 of 2024 which reads as under:

*“ Heard learned Senior Counsel for the
petitioner Shri S.D. Sanjay, who has appeared
through virtual mode and learned APP for the
State.*

*2. The petitioner seeks bail in
connection with Saharsa Sadar P.S. Case No. 520
of 2022 registered for the offence under Section*



489A, 489B and 120B of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, out of Rs.8,56,483/- deposited by the petitioner in the Kachahari Branch, SBI, Saharsa it is alleged that currency notes amounting to Rs.2,74,000/- are fake notes.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in this case 5. It is also submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is in jail since 07.10.2023.

6. Learned APP for the State vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioner for grant of bail by contending that this is serious offence and the petitioner is the person who has deposited the fake notes in the bank.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

9. The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial of the petitioner and conclude the same at the earliest. If there is no sufficient progress in the trial due to the fault of the prosecution side then the petitioner may renew his prayer for grant of bail.”

5. The trial has commenced. Out of 11 witnesses, three witnesses have been examined. This Court finds no ground to review its earlier order dated 22.02.2024.

6. Accordingly, this application stands dismissed.

7. The Court below is directed to expedite the trial.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

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

