

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.88918 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-655 Year-2023 Thana- SHAHPUR PATORI District- Samastipur

Ranjay Mahto @ Ranjay Kumar S/O Upendra Mahto R/O Village- Sarhad
Madho, P.S- Patori, District- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shashank Shekhar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Mushtaque Alam, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 10-01-2025 Heard Mr. Shashank Shekhar, learned Advocate for

the petitioner and Mr Mushtaque Alam, learned APP for the

State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail, who is in custody
in connection Patori P.S. Case No. 655 of 2023 registered for the
offence punishable under Section 394 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution alleges that on the fateful day,
three miscreants armed with pistols entered into the C.S.P. Bank
of the informant and looted Rs. 5,04,937/- from the counter of
the bank on the gun point.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner contended that
from the narrations made in the FIR, it would be evident that
allegedly all the miscreants were covered their faces with mask.
Later on during the course of investigation, it has come that they

were identified on the basis of the CCTV footage, which palpably appears to be quite doubtful. It is further contended that the name of the petitioner has surfaced on the confessional statement of co-accused Anurodh Kumar @ Anrudh Kumar. Moreover, there is no recovery of any incriminating material from the possession of the petitioner. It is also contended that in fact, the reason behind the false implication of the petitioner is his criminal antecedents, as has been disclosed in Paragraph No. 3 of the bail application, which clearly discloses that the petitioner bears six criminal antecedents. It is lastly contended that now the petitioner has incarcerated for over a period of one year.

5. On the other hand, learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the bail application and submits that the apart from six criminal antecedents of the petitioner, he was also identified through the CCTV footage. The prayer for bail of other co-accused persons, namely, Manish Kumar Meghnath @ Manish Kumar @ Meghnath and Anurodh Kumar @ Anrudh Kumar @ Anurudh Kumar has also turned down by this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 32708 of 2024 and Cr. Misc. No. 27223 of 2024 respectively.

6. Regard being had to the submissions made on

behalf of the parties and considering the fact that the prayer for bail of the co-accused persons, having identical allegation was turned down by this Court, coupled with the factum of identification of the petitioner on the basis of the CCTV footage by the employees of the Bank as well as criminal antecedents, this Court is not acceded to the prayer for bail of the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer is rejected.

7. It is expected that learned Trial Court shall take all the endeavors to expedite the Trial and conclude the same expeditiously.

(Harish Kumar, J.)

Jyoti Kumari/-

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