IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.56440 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -273 Year- 2016 Thana -WARSALIGANJ District- NAWADA

==========

1. Chhoti Yadav @ Awdhesh Kumar @ Awdhesh Yadav, son of Ram Prasad Yadav.
2. Chandan Yadav @ Chandan Kuamr, son of Bali Yadav.
3. Kamlesh Yadav, son of Banaras Yadav.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sheo Kumar Prasad
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Anand Mohan Prasad Mehta

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

2 05-12-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Warisaliganj P.S. Case No. 273 of 2016, registered under Sections 387, 385 and 504/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act, pending in the court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Nawada.

The accusation is that in the night of 16/17.11.2016 informant, Asharfi Shadab, being the Munsi of Jai Mata Di Enterprises belonging to Gopal Prasad, was sleeping in the temporary room, constructed at Dariyapur for extracting the sand. At that time, some persons started abusing by making firing saying that unless the ransom of Rs.25,00,000/- is not paid, the sand will not be extracted from there. In the meantime, they also started to

WEB COPY

knock the door when he woke up then saw that Dilip Rai, Munna Mahto and petitioners armed with rifle, pistol and lathi were present there. At that time, Dilip Rai, pointed the gun at his temporal region told to informant to Gopal Prasad, owner of Jai Mata Di Enterprises to give Rs.25,00,000/- as ransom, otherwise he will not be escaped. Earlier the vehicles were damaged and firing was made regarding which Warisaliganj P.S. Case No. 258 of 2016 is instituted.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have falsely been implicated in the case due to dirty politics, as they are resident of nearby the place of occurrence.

Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of allegation against the petitioners, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, their prayer for grant of anticipatory bail stands rejected. The petitioners are directed to surrender before the trial court within four weeks and pray for regular bail, which would be considered by the trial court in accordance with law without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

Bhardwaj/-

U		T	

WEB COPY