

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.12091 of 2017**

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -100 Year- 2016 Thana -PARSAUNI District- SITAMARHI

- =====
1. Shivji Rai, son of Late Ramchandra Rai,
  2. Kishuni Rai, son of Late Ramchandra Rai,
  3. Sonafi Rai, son of Late Ramchandra Rai
  4. Amit Kumar, son of Vishuni Rai,
  5. Amrish Kumar @ Amresh Kumar, son of Vishuni Rai, all are resident of Village- Benipur, P.S.- Parsoni, District- Sitamarhi.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

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

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                                      |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Sheo Kumar Prasad<br>Mr. Subodh Kumar, Advocates |
| For the State        | : | Mr. Sri Amitesh Kumar                                |
| For the informant    | : | Mr. Pushpendra Kumar Singh, Advocate                 |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      10-04-2017      Heard learned counsel for the petitioners.

The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Parsauni P.S. Case No. 100 of 2016, registered for offences punishable under Sections 143,144,323,324,307,379,504 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioners that there is general and omnibus allegation of assault to the informant and his family members by all the petitioners and there is case and counter case between the parties and persons from the side of the petitioners have also received injuries.

Heard learned A.P.P. and learned counsel for the



informant also.

Learned A.P.P. has pointed out that the injuries are on the vital part of the body of the informant and the opinion about the nature of injury has been kept reserved by the Doctor.

Having heard both sides and in view of the nature of injuries about which opinion has been kept reserved and that the injuries were on the head, this is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Their prayer for anticipatory bail is, accordingly, rejected.

However, the petitioners are directed to surrender before the learned court below and make prayer for regular bail, which will be considered by the learned court below without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

With the aforesaid observation, this application is dismissed.

**(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)**

S.Pandey/-

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

