

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.17768 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -93 Year- 2016 Thana -LAURIYA District-
WESTCHAMPARAN(BETTIAH)

=====

1. Bhual Ram @ Bhuaal Ram, son of Nathai Ram,
2. Banu Ram @ Mannu Ram, Son of Lakhani Ram,
3. Phulena Sharma, Son of Late Ganesh Sharma,
4. Brahmdev Yadav, Son of Late Suraj Bali Yadav,
5. Nathu Das, Son of Late Shiv Nandan Das, All Residents of Village-
Belwa More, Police Station- Lauriya, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arbind Kumar Singh, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Ahtash Ali Khan, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 26-04-2017 The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Lauriya P.S. Case No. 93 of 2016, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 149, 323, 379 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioners that there is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioners and they have been falsely implicated in this case. It has further been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that as the petitioner no. 5, has already been arrested, he is not pressing the bail application with regard to petitioner no. 5.

Learned counsel for the informant has submitted that all



the petitioners are accused in several other cases but this fact has not been brought on record by learned counsel for the petitioners in paragraph no. 3 rather it has been stated in paragraph no. 3 that the petitioners have got no criminal antecedent. Learned counsel for the petitioners could not controvert the aforesaid fact. It has also been stated by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners are land mafia.

Heard learned A.P.P. and learned counsel for the informant, who have opposed the prayer for bail.

Having heard both sides and in view of the fact that the petitioners have suppressed the fact about their criminal antecedent in paragraph no.3 of the bail application, there is sufficient reason to dismiss their bail application.

Hence, the prayer for bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

Ranjan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

