

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.15916 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -37 Year- 2017 Thana -GAURICHAK District- PATNA

=====

Dilip Singh @ Dilip Kumar Singh Son of Sri Vishwanath Singh, Resident
of Village- Khushhal Chak, P.S.- Gaurichak, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satish Chandra Mishra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Rajendra Prasad Nat, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2. 14-06-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

Petitioner is seeking Anticipatory Bail in
connection with Gaurichak P.S. Case No. 37 of 2017
registered for the offence punishable under Sections 411,
413 and 414 of the Indian Penal Code.

The First Information Report has been lodged
by the Assistant Sub-Inspector of Police alleging therein
that in course of investigation, in connection with Bypass
P.S. Case No. 28/2017 under Section 461 and 379 of the
Indian Penal Code, he got an information that the stolen
properties are lying in the premises of M/s Kishan Khad
Bhandar of which the present petitioner is the proprietor. It
is alleged that in course of search some of the stolen
properties, details of which have been given in the First
Information Report, were recovered from the premises.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits
that the present case has been lodged at the instance of the
persons who are rivals in business. Learned counsel further



submits that the seizure is not in accordance with Section 100 Cr.P.C. and that the petitioner has got no criminal antecedent.

However, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that since First Information Report itself contains the description of the goods and articles recovered from the premises of the present petitioner and those are found to be stolen property, in any view of the matter, it is not a case for exercise of discretion to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner for the offences as alleged.

Hence, I am not inclined to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner. Prayer is rejected.

In case, the petitioner surrenders within a period of four weeks and prays for regular bail, the same shall be considered on its own merit without being prejudiced by the orders of this Court.

Rajeev/-

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J.)

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

