

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.42890 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -39 Year- 2017 Thana -DINARA District- SASARAM (ROHTAS)

=====

1. Dinesh Singh @ Dineshwar Prasad Singh Son of Kesho Singh, R/o
Village- Garigawan, P.S.- Dinara (Bhanas O.P.), District- Rohtas.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kanhaiya Pandey, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Rajendra Nath Jha, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

3 18-10-2017 Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

This application, for grant of anticipatory bail, arises
out of Dinara Police Station Case No. 39 of 2017, disclosing
offences under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that
the petitioner, who is of clean antecedent, is innocent and has
not committed any offence. In fact, the petitioner is said to be
Organizer of Chacha Nehru Residential School in which the
deceased used to reside in hostel. As a matter of fact, the
deceased has committed suicide being frustrated and annoyed by
the act of his father. The F.I.R. has been lodged on 22.02.2017
whereas the same has been received in the court on 25.02.2017



after lapse of three days which creates doubt over the prosecution version. There is no eye witness to the alleged occurrence supporting the allegation. Hence, the petitioner deserves the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that this petitioner is solely responsible for the death of son of informant. According to post mortem report, a symmetrical ligature mark over upper part of neck has been found on the deceased and it is observed by the doctor that the deceased died by strangulation of his neck. Investigation of this case is still going on.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of this petitioner is rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J.)

Brajesh/-

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

