

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.57221 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -130 Year- 2015 Thana -BHAGWANPUR District-
VAISHALI(HAJIPUR)

- =====
1. Prameshwar Singh, S/O Late Ami Singh, resident of Village- Pratap Tand, P.S. Bhagwanpur, District- Vaishali.
 2. Ranjit Singh, S/O Harinandan Singh, resident of village- Bhatwaliya Bhagwan, P.S.- Kartahan, District- Vaishali
 3. Pinkesh Kumar, S/O Sri, Prameshwar Singh, resident of Village- Pratap Tand, P.S. Bhagwanpur, District- Vaishali.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Umeshanand Pandit, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nand Kishor Prasad (App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR
JHA

ORAL ORDER

5 28-07-2016 Heard both sides.

The prayer of anticipatory bail petition of petitioner no.
1 is dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 30.06.2016.

The petitioner nos. 2 and 3 apprehend their arrest in
Bhagwanpur P.S. Case No. 130/2015, registered for the offences
punishable under Section 307 and other sections of the Indian
Penal Code.

The informant alleged that after receiving invitation card
from Parmeshwar Singh he went to his darwaja to participate in
the reception party of his son. There was orchestra and some
altercation took place for singing son, on such Parmeshwar Singh

ordered his son Putul Kumar and Vinod Kumar and his brother to bring rifle, gun and thereafter they made indiscriminate firing. The informant received pellet injury fired by Putul Kumar and the pellet stuck in the chest of the informant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Petitioner no. 1 Parmeshwar Singh was the order giver and the firing made by the petitioners did not hit anybody.

The informant has very categorically stated that firing made by Putul Kumar hit his elbow, but it appears that informant has alleged that petitioners also made indiscriminate firing, but fortunately, firing made by the petitioners did not hit anybody.

Considering the facts aforesaid, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner nos. 2 and 3 above-named on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J.)

Vinita/-

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