

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.13208 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -12 Year- 2015 Thana -DUMARIA District- GAYA

=====

1. Rajesh Yadav, S/o Gurucharan Yadav, Resident of Village- Bagpur, P.S.-
Dumaria, District- Gaya.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arvind Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Humayou Ahmad Khan

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRIYA
ORAL ORDER

3 13-04-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Dumariya P.S.
Case No. 12 of 2015 instituted for the offence under Sections-212,
216, 325, 326, 307, 353, 302, 435, 379 & other minor sections of
the Indian Penal Code, 27 of the Arms Act, Sections-3, 4 & 5 of
the Explosive Substances Act, Section-17 of CLA Act, Sections-
10, 11 and 13(i), 13(ii) of UAP Act.

It is alleged in the written report that on the date of
occurrence, when the informant with other police constable was in
forest area, the petitioner and other accused persons who were
members of Bhakpa Maowadi Naxal Organization, started
following the activity of the police constable and when the police
constables were on the bus and the bus reached at Salaiya Turning



Dumariya, the accused persons including the petitioner exploded the bomb on the way of the bus on account of which, bus turtled. Two police constables died during their treatment in Gaya and other police constables sustained injuries as mentioned in the written report.

The C.D. has been received.

The learned APP submitted that witnesses in various paragraphs of case diary have supported the case and had taken the name of petitioner. The postmortem report also shows that death has occurred on account of injury caused by blast burn and hard blunt substance. Learned Sessions Judge has mentioned in the impugned order that witnesses in several paragraphs have supported the occurrence.

In such circumstances, this court does not find it a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

The petitioner may surrender and make prayer for regular bail which shall be disposed of by the court below in accordance with law without being prejudiced by order of this court.

(Sanjay Priya, J)

A.K.V./-

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

