

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.39889 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -149 Year- 2016 Thana -LAKHNAUR District- MADHUBANI

=====

1. Shankar Jha Son of Late Bhogi Jha,
2. Pappu Kunwar @ Pappu Kumar Son of Lal Kumar,
3. Mukta Nand Jha Son of Late Dukhi Jha,
4. Sagar Kumar Jha @ Sagar Jha Son of Sanjay Murari,
5. Sanjay Murari Son of Mohan Jha All Resident of Village-Lakhnour, P.S.
Lakhnour, District-Madhubani. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party.

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Barun Kumar Choudhary, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Asharaf Ansari, Adv.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR
JHA**

ORAL ORDER

2 30-08-2017

Heard both sides.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in Lakhnour P.S.Case No. 149 of 2016, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 143, 147, 149, 152, 186, 183, 427, 341, 323, 332, 333, 353, 504, 506, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

The prayer for anticipatory bail petition of the petitioners was earlier rejected by this Court vide order dated 01.05.2017 passed in Cr.Misc.No. 10920 of 2017.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that one Mahanand Jha @ Mayakant Jha @ Bhairab Jha vide Cr.Misc.No. 18055 of 2017 was granted anticipatory bail by a coordinate bench of this Court vide



order dated 14.06.2017 passed in Cr.Misc.No. 18055 of 2017 and therefore, the petitioners again filed this anticipatory bail petition.

It appears from the allegation that the Electrical Assistant Engineer is the informant of the case. The petitioners and others had blocked the road due to non-supply of electric line. The informant, Block Development Officer, Circle Officer reached at the place of occurrence and while the informant was trying to redress the grievance of the villagers, the petitioners and others indiscriminately assaulted the informant with fists and slaps and took out chips of video camera.

After considering all the allegations, the anticipatory bail petition of the petitioners was earlier rejected. Now this type of occurrence is very rampant that the villagers take law in their own hands and assaulted public servant.

Considering the facts aforesaid, I do not find any new facts to consider the case of the petitioners. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail of the petitioners is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

Nitesh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

