
(2021) 02 JH CK 0017

In the Jharkhand High Court

Case No : Bail Application No. 12143 Of 2020

Surendra Lohra @ Ekbal Lohra

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Jharkhand

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 01-02-2021

Acts Referred:

Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 120B, 147, 148, 149, 302, 307, 324, 326, 353, 427
Arms Act, 1959 — Section 27
Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1932 — Section 17
Explosive Substances Act 1883 — Section 3, 4
Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 — Section 16, 18, 20

Citation : (2021) 02 JH CK 0017

Hon'ble Judges : Anil Kumar Choudhary, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Rajesh Kr., Ashok Kr.

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to remove the defects pointed out by the stamp reporter within two weeks after the lockdown is over.

In view of personal undertaking given by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the defects pointed out by the stamp reporter are ignored for the present.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with Senha P.S. Case No.50 of 2011 corresponding to G.R. No.229 of 2011 (S.T. No.92 of

2014) registered under Sections 147, 148, 149, 302, 307, 326, 353, 427, 120 (B) and 324 of the Indian Penal Code, Section 27 of the Arms Act, Section

17 of the C.L.A. Act, Section 3/4 of the Explosive Substance Act and Section 16, 18, 20 of the U.A.P. Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner was the member of Maoist extremists group and fired upon the police personnel and committed serial blast. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is further submitted that so far as seven witnesses have been examined in this case, the copy of the certified copy of whom has been kept at page-19-25 of the brief and none of them have named the petitioner. It is then submitted that the petitioner undertakes that he will co-operate with the trial of the case. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 23.01.2014 which is evident from the impugned order. Hence it is submitted that the petitioner be released on bail.

Learned Addl. P.P. opposes the prayer for bail. Considering the facts of this case, the above named petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees twenty five thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional Sessions Judge-II, Lohardaga in connection with Senha P.S. Case No.50 of 2011 corresponding to G.R. No.229 of 2011 (S.T. No.92 of 2014) with the condition that he will co-operate with the trial of the case.