

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.48795 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -274 Year- 2016 Thana -NARPATGANJ District- ARRARIA

=====

1. Parmeshwari Rideo, son of Bihari Rideo,
2. Hiranand Rideo, son of Sattan Rideo,
3. Sachin Rideo, son of Hiranand Rideo,
4. Mahesh Rideo, son of Lakhichand Rideo,
5. Dhiren Rideo @ Dharendra Rideo, son of Parmeshwari Rideo.
6. Biren Rideo @ Birendra Rideo, son of Parmeshwari Rideo,
All are Resident of Village- Farhi, Ward No. 8, P.S.- Narpatganj,
Dist.- Araria.

.... Petitioners

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ramesh Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Ashok Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 06-12-2016 At the very outset, Sri Ramesh Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioners, in presence of Sri Ashok Kumar Singh, learned Addl. Public Prosecutor as well as Mr. Enamul Haque, learned counsel, who has voluntarily appeared on behalf of the informant, submits that during pendency of the present petition, petitioner no.3, namely, Sachin Rideo has already been arrested.

Accordingly, anticipatory bail petition, so far as petitioner no.3 is concerned, stands dismissed as the same has become infructuous.

Heard Sri Ramesh Kumar Singh, learned counsel



for the petitioners, Sri Ashok Kumar Singh, learned Addl. Public Prosecutor as well as Mr. Enamul Haque, learned counsel for the informant.

Petitioners, in the present case, have prayed for grant of anticipatory bail in Narpatganj P.S. Case No.274 of 2016 registered for the offence under Sections 447, 341, 323, 354, 379/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

It was submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that in the present case, F.I.R. was lodged much belatedly and the petitioners have falsely been implicated. He submits that prior to lodging of the F.I.R. a Sanha was lodged by one of the petitioners of the present case, namely, Birendra Risideo. On the aforesaid ground, a prayer has been made for grant of anticipatory bail. However, after going through the F.I.R. the Court is of the opinion that it is not a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

The petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

NKS/-

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

