WEB COPY NOT OFFICIAL

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.23189 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -76 Year- 2015 Thana -SANGRAMPUR District- MUNGER

==========

1. Lali Yadav, son of Chandeshwar Yadav
2. Sanjay Yadav, son of Chandeshwar Yadav
3. Rajesh Kumar Yadav @ Rajesh Yadav, son of Muneshwar Yadav
   All are residents of Village-Maheshpur, P.S.-Sangrampur, District-Munger

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shivendra Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Narendra Kr.Singh(APP)

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. ANJANA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

3 29-08-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State.

The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Sangrampur P.S. Case No.76 of 2015 for allegedly having committed the offence under Sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 307 and 302 of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the court of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Munger.

Case diary in the present case was called for, which has since been received.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned counsel for the State and on consideration of the materials in the case diary, including the post-mortem report, it

appears that these petitioners had together attacked the deceased as well as the informant and another member of his family. It also appears that during the course of treatment, the injured, father of the informant, succumbed to his injuries. The post-mortem report reveals that all the injuries are on the vital parts of body of the deceased and other persons are also said to have received serious injuries on the scalp.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after taking into consideration the fact that all the petitioners have attacked the deceased as well as the others and that the cumulative effect of such attack is the death of the father of the informant, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to these petitioners. It is, accordingly, rejected

(Anjana Mishra, J)

PNM

U		T	