

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.42764 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -97 Year- 2016 Thana -PAKRIDAYAL District-
EASTCHAMPARAN(MOTIHARI)

=====

Rameshwar Narayan Singh @ Chhedi Singh Son of Late Yogendra Singh
Resident of village - Tharbitiya, P.S. Pakaridayal, District - East Champaran

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Smt. Veena Kumari Jaiswal

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT KUMAR
SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

3 22-12-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Pakri Dayal P.S. Case No. 97 of 2016 registered under Sections-
307, 302, 120(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code and 27 of the Arms
Act.

Petitioner is named in the first information report
and it is alleged that he hatched up a conspiracy along with other
accused and after that, the present occurrence took place.

Submission on behalf of the petitioner is that the
petitioner has been implicated in this case on account of previous
enmity and as a matter of fact, there is nothing on record to show



that the petitioner was also involved in the present case.

On the other hand, learned counsel, appearing for the informant submits that sons of petitioner are accused in the present case and they participated actively in the present crime. Moreover, in course of investigation, vide paragraph-8 of the case diary, witnesses claimed to have seen the petitioner, standing near the place of occurrence, prior to the alleged occurrence and, therefore, the aforesaid fact goes to show that the petitioner had also participated in the present crime.

Admittedly, the informant who claims to be eye witness of the alleged occurrence has not stated about the presence of the petitioner on the place of occurrence but subsequently, one so-called eye witness claims to have seen the petitioner present on the place of occurrence.

Moreover, considering the above-said facts and circumstances of the case as well as submission of the parties, I am of the opinion that it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail and, accordingly this anticipatory bail petition is allowed and it is ordered that the petitioner named above, in the event of his arrest or surrender in the court below within four weeks from the date of receipt/production of copy of this order, shall be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two



sureties of the like amount each in connection with Pakri Dayal P.S. Case No. 97 of 2016 to the satisfaction of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-Vth, East Champaran, Motihari subject to condition as laid down u/S 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure Code.

(Hemant Kumar Srivastava, J)

A.K.V./-

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

