

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Miscellaneous No.6842 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -80 Year- 2017 Thana -GOPALPUR District-
WESTCHAMPARAN(BETTIAH)

=====

1. Jagarnath Baitha @ Jaganath Baitha son of Late Dasai Baitha.
2. Chhedi Baitha, son of Jagarnath Baitha.
3. Jhunna Baitha, son of Jagarnath Baitha.
4. Bhajan Baitha, son of Jagarnath Baitha.
5. Kishor Baitha @ Kishore Baitha, son of Late Lahwar Baitha.
6. Chhote Lal Baitha, son of Tawari Baitha,
7. Sumit Baitha @ Sunil Baitha, son of Dhanukh Baitha,

All are resident of Village- Laxmipur, Police Station- Pursottampur,
District- West Champaran.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar No.7, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ahtash Ali Khan, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 19-02-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection
with Gopalpur P.S. Case No.80 of 2017 registered under Sections
147, 149, 341, 323, 386, 380, 504, 354(B) and 506 of the Indian



Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the case relates to a land dispute as the petitioners are claiming possession over a piece of land which according to him is Gairmajarua land and these petitioners belong to Scheduled Caste category. There is a counter case as well at the instance of petitioner no.1 on 05.06.2017.

Learned APP for the State opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that from the FIR, as contained in Annexure-1, it appears that according to informant these petitioners forcibly entered in the house, abused the informant and demanded rangdari of Rs.3,00,000/-. They also threatened the informant and entered in the house and took out Rs.1,00,000/- cash and some ornaments. He also pointed out that Annexure-2 has been lodged after two days of lodging of Annexure-1. Apparently, the same was registered for saving the skin from the case lodged by the informant.

Considering the facts and circumstances particularly that there are allegations of forcibly entering into the house of the informant and demanding rangdari of Rs.3,00,000/- against these petitioners, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



The application is dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Arvind/-

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

