

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.21794 of 2017**

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -296 Year- 2012 Thana -MANIGACHI District- DARBHANGA

=====

1. Md. Alzama @ Alzama Son of Asgar,
2. Ehsanul @ Ehsan Son of Muslim,
3. Alkamar @ Akbar Son of Asgar
4. Quadir Son of Manzoor,
5. Haider Son of Husaini,
6. Sahiduzzama @ Md. Sahiduzzama, Son of Samsuzzama @ Samsul Haque,
7. Md. Quais Son of Ful Hassan,
8. Md. Ekrar @ Kari Son of Heera
9. Shoaib Son of Bauku,
10. Owais Son of Ful Hasan
11. Gulab Son of Inamul,
12. Aftab Son of Yusuf,
13. Zafirul Haque, Son of Safiur Rahman,
14. Ekramul, Son of Muslim,
15. Nesarul Haque @ Nesarul Son of Ainul Haque,
16. Ansarul Haque Son of Ainul Haque,
17. Equbal Ali @ Equbal Son of Waris
18. Sajid Son of Zahir,
19. Kalim Son of Juhi,
20. Murtuza Son of Taslim,
21. Md. Nasir @ Md. Absir Ahad Son of Manjoor

All Resident of Village- Jagdishpur Gaina, P.S. Manigachhi, District- Darbhanga.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... .... Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Madhusudan Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Sri Sunil Kumar Pandey

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      01-07-2017      Heard Sri Madhusudan Kumar, learned counsel for the  
petitioners and learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

Twenty one petitioners, have approached this court  
with a prayer to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail in



Manigachhi P.S. Case No. 296 of 2012 registered for the offence under sections 147, 149, 341, 323, 353, 153(A), 298, 379 and 504 of the Indian Penal Code.

It was submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that earlier a writ petition vide CWJC No. 1692 of 2006 was filed for raising boundary wall of the graveyard and in compliance with the order of this court dated 27.01.2011 while the officials arrived for constructing boundary wall in between two communities dispute arose and it was alleged that the accused persons interfered with the officials. It was submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioners were only spectators and they have been falsely implicated in the present case, however, considering the fact that petitioners were named as accused in the F.I.R., which was lodged long back on 29.9.2012, there is no reason to entertain the petition for grant of anticipatory bail, which was filed in the month May, 2017.

The petition stands dismissed.

**(Rakesh Kumar, J)**

Praful/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

