



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.47863 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -510 Year- 2014 Thana -LAHERIASARAI District- DARBHANGA

=====

LALIT YADAV @ LALIT KUMAR YADAV SON OF SITAMBAR
YADAV @ PITAMBAR YADAV R/O MOHALLA- DILWARPUR, L.C.
COLLEGE, P.S.- BAHADURPUR, DISTRICT- DARBHANGA

.... PETITIONER/S

VERSUS

THE STATE OF BIHAR

.... OPPOSITE PARTY/S

=====

with

Criminal Miscellaneous No.90 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -510 Year- 2014 Thana -LAHERIASARAI District- DARBHANGA

=====

ARVIND KUMAR YADAV, SON OF YOGENDRA KHAIRWAR,
RESIDENT OF MOHALLA-CHHAPKI PARRI, P.S.-SADAR,
DISTRICT-DARBHANGA.

.... PETITIONER/S

VERSUS

THE STATE OF BIHAR

.... OPPOSITE PARTY/S

=====

Appearance:

(In Cr. Misc. No.47863 of 2014)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gopal Jha, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Smt. Pronoti Singh, APP

(In Cr. Misc. No.90 of 2015)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gopal Jha, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dr. Ajeet Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR TRIVEDI
ORAL ORDER

2 16-04-2015 Criminal Miscellaneous No.47863 of 2014 wherein

Lalit Yadav @ Lalit Kumar Yadav is the petitioner where

Criminal Miscellaneous No.90 of 2015 wherein Arvind Kumar

Yadav is the petitioner, commonly originate out of

Laheriyasarai P.S. Case No.510 of 2014 on account thereof,

have been heard together and are being disposed of by a

common order.



Petitioners who happens to be habituated in terrorizing the informant a lady doctor and for that they have earlier been prosecuted, again indulged and demanded Rs.5 lacs as Rangdari after visiting her clinic. On hue and cry raised by doctor, the persons present in the clinic including the staff arrived and till then, it has been said that petitioner Lalit Yadav @ Lalit Kumar Yadav snatched away purse containing Rs.20 thousand.

It has been submitted on behalf of petitioners that petitioner Lalit Yadav @ Lalit Kumar Yadav happens to be an employee engaged by the doctor / informant Dr. Miss. Sangeeta Singh and her husband Dr. Navin Prasad Singh had issued certificate to that effect (Annexure-2). It has also been submitted that so far Arvind Kumar Yadav is concerned there happens to be no specific allegation against him. It has further submitted that on account of dispute over payment of wages, this case has purposely been filed.

After going through the case diary, it is apparent that Navin Kumar does not happens to be the husband of informant. Her husband happens to be one Md. Samshad Hussain whose statement has been recorded under para-7 of the case diary who including other witnesses have also supported indulgence of petitioners including others in such

kind of anti-social activities.

That being so, I do not see it a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail is rejected.

(Aditya Kumar Trivedi, J.)

PN/-

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