

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.77320 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-898 Year-2024 Thana- PHULWARISHARIF District- Patna

Satish Surendra Prasad @ Satish Surendra Prasad S/O Surendra Verma R/O
Village- Narayanpur, P.S- Naubatpur, Distt.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Khushi Awadh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Awadhesh Kumar Singh, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

3 19-03-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Phulwarisharif P.S. Case No.898 of 2024 registered for an
offence punishable under Sections 392 of the Indian Penal
Code.

3. As per prosecution case, on 29.06.2024 informant
had submitted a written report that after de-boarding from the
Pune-Patna Express train at Danapur, he came outside to take a
tempo to reach Patna but in the alleged tempo two unknown
persons were already seated and instead of going to Patna the
tempo took turn to AIIMS road and in front of the Govindpur
Madhyam Vidyalaya the unknown persons assaulted the
informant and snatched 10,000/- cash along with other articles.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that petitioner is not named in the FIR. Petitioner's tempo is being surfaced from the CCTV footage and during the investigation of the alleged tempo, petitioner is found to be the owner of the tempo bearing Registration No. BR/01PP/9370 The petitioner is in custody since 17.08.2024.

5. Learned APP for the State, vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances as well as the fact that petitioner is owner of the said tempo and all the looted articles were recovered from the possession of the petitioner as apparent from the paragraph 27 of the case diary and further in paragraph nos. 2, 3, 4 and 43 of the case diary, several witnesses have supported the prosecution, so I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

7. However petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after completion of one year in custody before the Trial court.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Harshita/-

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

