

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74224 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-852 Year-2023 Thana- SONEPUR District- Saran

=====

Akash Kumar @ Tapa Son of Sita Ram Rai Resident of Village - Parmejabad,
P.S.- Sonepur, District - Saran at Chapra

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Alok Kumar Alok, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Prem Kumar Jha, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 05-12-2024 Heard Learned Counsel for the petitioner and
Learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Sonepur P.S. Case No.852 of 2023 lodged under Section 392 of
the I.P.C. and later on section 412 of the I.P.C.

3. As per the prosecution case, the F.I.R. has been
lodged against three unknown accused persons against whom
there is allegation that they have snatched mobile phone of the
informant sitting on the motorcycle.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He submits
that the petitioner's name has figured in this case by virtue of
confessional statement of co-accused. He further submits that
the petitioner was not put on T.I.P. and from his possession,
nothing has been recovered.

5. Counsel also submits that one of the co-accused has



been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 17.02.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 7228/2024.

6. Counsel further submits that petitioner is in custody since 05.01.2024 having 7 criminal antecedent in which he is on bail in 4 cases and in rest cases, he is persuading for bail.

7. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that it is true that the petitioner's name has figured by virtue of confessional statement, but the said confessional statement has further been corroborated by virtue of recovery of motorcycle which was subject to theft on the disclosure of the said person who has made the said confession.

8. Upon specific query whether charge has been framed or not. Counsel submits that he is not aware about the framing of charge.

9. In the present facts and circumstances of this case and the submissions made above, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the bail application of the petitioner is hereby rejected, but liberty is hereby granted to the petitioner that he may renew his prayer for bail 6 months after framing of charge.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Prakashmani/-

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

