

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.34898 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -107 Year- 2016 Thana -DIGHALBANK District- KISANGANJ

=====

Dharampal Bharti, son of Jaadu Lal Sah, R/o Village- Tulsiya, P.S.-
dighalbank, District- Kishanganj.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Rajesh Jha @ Mathari @ Madan., Son of Mahant Kumar Jha.
3. Pinki Jha @ W/o Rajesh Jha,
4. Shankar Sah, Son of Jagdish Sha,
5. Sarswati Devi W/o Shankar Sah,
6. Pappu Sah, Son of Shankar Sah,
7. Sanjay Sah Son of Bharat Sah,
8. Sandhya Devi @ Sandhiya Devi W/o Sanjay Sah,
9. Bharat Sah Son of Yadunandan Sah,
10. Kismati Devi W/o Bharat Sah,
11. Gita Devi W/o Dinesh Sah, All R/o Village- Dakshin Basti Tulsiya,
P.S.- Dighalbank, District- Kishanganj.

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rashid Izhar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ganesh Prasad Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 26-07-2017 This application has been filed for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to opposite party Nos. 2 to 11(petitioners) by this Court vide order dated 24.3.2017 passed in Cr.Misc.No.12138 of 2017 on the ground that learned counsel for the opposite parties had made false submission that compromise has been made between the parties and now they are harassing the petitioner-informant in this case.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned



APP.

From perusal of the record it appears that vide order dated 25.7.2017 passed in Cr.Misc.No. 12138 of 2017 after hearing learned counsel for the petitioners and considering the facts and circumstances the order dated 24.3.2017 passed in the said case has been modified after recording the submission of learned counsel for the petitioners, as a supplementary affidavit has also been filed explaining the said compromise.

In the said circumstances, I am not inclined to interfere with the order dated 24.3.2017 of this Court by which prayer for anticipatory bail has been allowed.

However, opposite party Nos. 2 to 11 are directed not to make any threat to the petitioner-informant and not to tamper with the evidence in this case. If any such threat is made by them, prosecution is free to move for cancellation of their bail bonds.

With the above observation, this application is dismissed.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

spal/-

U			
---	--	--	--

