

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5180 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-912 Year-2023 Thana- SASARAM NAGAR District- Rohtas

Ramjit Yadav, aged about 24 years, Male Son of Sikandar Yadav, Resident of Village- Hariharpur P.S.- Shahpur District- Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nakul Jamuar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jharkhandi Upadhyay, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND
MALVIYA**

ORAL ORDER

3 21-03-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sasaram Nagar PS Case No. 912 of 2023 instituted for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 379, 120(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, 4-5 unknown persons took away the loaded truck of the informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence and has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that the petitioner has no knowledge of the said occurrence. Petitioner and the informant are co-villagers and the petitioner is a poor person and had gone to earn his livelihood and became the



victim of the conspiracy. Petitioner has got clean antecedent and is in custody since 07.10.2023.

5. Learned APP opposes the prayer for bail.

6. From perusal of the FIR, seizure list and the impugned order of the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtas at Sasaram dated 07.12.2023, it appears that on the basis of written report of Ankush Kumar Yadav the case has been registered against five accused persons including the petitioner under Sections 406, 420, 379, 120(b) and 34 of the IPC and there is specific allegation against Driver, Gopal Yadav and Khalasi Ramjit Yadav (petitioner) and also from perusal of the records, it appears that petitioner is named in the FIR. The informant as well as the witnesses have supported the prosecution case in their statement recorded under Section 161 of the Cr.P.C. From perusal of the impugned order, it also appears that the confessional statement of the co-accused persons are given in the C.D.R. as also all the accused persons were in touch via mobile along with the petitioner. Petitioner has involved in the alleged commission of the offence, which is very serious in nature.

7. Considering the nature of allegation and seriousness of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant the



bail of the petitioner.

8. The prayer for regular bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

9. However, the learned trial Court is directed to conclude the trial preferable within a period of six months from the date of receipt of this order and if the trial is not concluded within the stipulated period then the petitioner shall renew the prayer for bail before the trial Court.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Anand Kr.

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

