

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.31982 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -193 Year- 2018 Thana -HAJIPUR SADAR District-
VAISHALI(HAJIPUR)

=====

1. Arbind Rai @ Arbind Kumar Rai,
2. Manoj Rai @ Manoj Kumar Rai,
3. Vinod Rai @ Vinod Rai @ Vinod Kumar Rai, All are sons of Mishri Lal Rai,
4. Pappu Rai @ Pappu Kumar Rai,
5. Vikky Kumar @ Vikky Kumar Rai, Both are sons of Paras Rai,
6. Mahesh Rai, Son of Late Hari Rai, All are resident of Village- Shubhai, P.S.- Sadar Hajipur, District- Vaishali at Hajipur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjay Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Gauri Shankar Gupta

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 27-06-2018 The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Sadar Hajipur P.S. Case No. 193 of 2018, registered for offences punishable under Sections 341, 342, 383, 384, 395, 447, 420, 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Prosecution case is that informant had purchased six decimals of land and when he started construction, petitioners came and threatened him and demanded rangdari from him and due to that informant paid Rs. 1 lac but they started demanding another four lakhs, thereafter, the informant sold the land to one Sahdeo Rai and the petitioners again not allowing the said Sahdeo Rai to do any construction over the said land, then the Sahdeo Rai approached the informant and demanded his money or ensure the



construction over the said land and when the informant went to the accused persons, they abused him and also locked him in a room.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioners that the said land was already sold to one Sujit Kumar and there was dispute between the said Sujit Kumar and Sahdeo Rai and a proceeding under Section 107 of the Cr.P.C. was also initiated over the said land. Petitioners have no role to play in the occurrence and have falsely been made accused in this case.

Heard learned A.P.P. also.

Having heard both sides, considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of accusation, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

However, the petitioner, if so desire, may surrender before the court below and pray for regular bail and if any such application is filed the same will be decided by the court below on the merit of the case and the court below shall pass an appropriate order, if possible on same day, without being prejudiced by the order of this court.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

sunil/-

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

