

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11068 of 2024

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

Md. Arman Son Of Latif Mian @ Md. Latif Resident Of Village- Keshopur,
Ps- Sakra, Distt- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Rina Sinha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Pronoti Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 08-05-2024 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 395/412/120B of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution, FIR has been lodged against
seven unknown accused persons with allegation that they have
looted Rs.7,90,590/- from the Bank along with ATM card and
other documents.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. Counsel
submits that during investigation his name has figured and
recovery of Rs.25,67,500/- has been made from the petitioner's
possession. It is due to this reason, police has inserted the



petitioner’s name. Counsel submits that recovery of money has been made with the petitioner but it is in another case, i.e., Hajipur Town P.S. Case No.458 of 2021, in the present case he has been remanded. Counsel fairly submits that there are four criminal antecedents of the petitioner and he is in custody since 29.04.2022 in the present case.

5. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that antecedent of the petitioner is not clean. There are four criminal cases pending against the petitioner and the alleged dacoity has been taken place in the State Bank of India whereas the money alleged to have been recovered from the possession is of H.D.F.C. Bank.

6. In this background, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner that he may renew his prayer for bail one year after framing of the charge, if not framed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Mkr./-

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

