IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.11418 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -413 Year- 2017 Thana -MINAPUR District- MUZAFFARPUR

==========

1. Hind Keshri Yadav, S/o Late Naresh Rai, Resident of Village- Chhapara, P.S.- Minapur, District- Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Punam Shrivastava
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA

ORAL ORDER

3 06-03-2018 Heard both sides.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Minapur P.S. Case No.413 of 2017 registered under Sections 147, 148, 149, 342, 341, 332, 333, 353, 427, 323, 337, 224, 225, 504/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The informant alleged that he got secret information that accused of Minapur P.S. Case No.42 of 2017, 225 of 2017 namely, Hind Keshri Yadav had come to his house. On such, a raid was conducted and Hind Keshri Yadav was apprehended but he tried to flee away. Many other villagers having armed with different weapons came there and attacked on the raiding party and got the petitioner freed from the custody of the police.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the

WEB COPY

petitioner was in fact, not in the house. It is false to say that the petitioner was arrested by the police. The family members were residing in the house. When the police reached the house of the petitioner, the villagers made protest that since only female members are residing, therefore, the police should not have raided the house to arrest the petitioner but it appears from perusal of the records that besides the allegation made against the petitioner that he fled away from custody of the police, the petitioner has got criminal antecedent and he is accused in as many as 7 cases registered under Section 307 I.P.C., Section 27 of Arms Act and Section 3/4 of Explosive Substance Act.

Considering the facts aforesaid, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

Saurabh/-

U		T	

WEB COPY