

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.49724 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -463 Year- 2009 Thana -LAKHISARAI District- LAKHISARAI

- =====
1. Jahuri Yadav son of Late Mangal Yadav
 2. Ramashish Yadav
 3. Rajesh Yadav Both are sons of Jahuri Yadav All are Resident of Village :- Dhadhisir , P.S.:- Chanan, District:- Lakhisarai
 4. Daso Yadav Son of Late Mohan Yadav Resident of Village :- Barari , P.S.:- Chanan, District:- Lakhisarai

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ambika Bhagat

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Aditya Narayan Singh-I(App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 30-04-2015 The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Lakhisarai (Chanan) P.S.Case No. 463 of 2009 instituted under Sections 147,148, 149, 323, 342 and 364(A) of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the Court of learned C.J.M., Lakhisarai.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the State.

The prosecution story, in brief, is that one Ashrfi Yadav filed Complaint No. 182 (C)/2009 before the learned C.J.M., Lakhisarai and the same was referred u/s 156(3) Cr.P.C. to the police stating therein that when he along with his family members were harvesting wheat crop in their field, the accused persons named in the Complaint/FIR and others arrived there and caught

Billat Yadav. Apprehending accused Billat Yadav tried to flee away from the field but was assaulted by the accused persons by means of butt of Masket. The victim Billat Yadav is the son of the informant. Accused persons also demanded ransom of Rs. 1,00,000/- to release him. Search was made but traceless. The informant claimed that his son was kidnapped for ransom.

It is submitted on behalf of the petitioners that the informant and other sides are family members of the same family and due to land dispute they have falsely been implicated in this case.

On behalf of the State, it is submitted that the victim has not been recovered.

Considering the aforesaid facts, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is rejected.

However, if the petitioners surrender in the court below within a period of six weeks and pray for regular bail, the same shall be considered on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order of rejection.

(Sudhir Singh, J)

singh/-

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