

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68205 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-216 Year-2020 Thana- RAJGIR District- Nalanda

Yogendra Rajbanshi @ Jogendar Kumar Son of Suresh Rajbanshi Villlage-
Arai (keshopur) Po- Arai, Ps- Atri, Dist- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Purushotam Sharma, Advocate
For the State : Mr.Umesh Lal Verma, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 23-01-2025 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. 8491 of 2024.

3. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Rajgir
P.S. Case No. 216 of 2020 registered for the offence punishable
under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code.

4. The following order was passed on 22.02.2024 in
Cr. Misc. No. 8491 of 2024 which reads as under:

*“Heard learned counsel for the
petitioner and learned APP for the State.*

*2. The petitioner seeks bail in
connection with Rajgir P.S. Case No. 216 of
2020 registered for the offence under Section
392 of the Indian Penal Code.*

3. As per the prosecution case, the



petitioner and others are said to have looted Rs. 2,60,000/- from the informant.

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 07.07.2023.

6. Learned APP for the State vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioner for grant of bail by contending that the petitioner has committed day light loot and materials have come during investigation to connect the petitioner with the crime.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner though, it has been argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that other co-accused person has been granted bail by this Court.

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. This Court finds no new ground to review its earlier order dated 22.02.2024.

6. Accordingly, this application stands dismissed.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

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

