

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17554 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-829 Year-2018 Thana- HAJIPUR District- Vaishali

=====

Pintu Singh @ Arvind Kumar, son of Late Rajendra Prasad Singh Resident of
Chanakya Colony, P.S.- Hajipur (Sadar), District- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Fakhruddin Ali Ahmad

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Zainul Abedin

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 10-07-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel appearing on behalf of the State.

Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Hajipur Nagar P.S. Case No.829 of 2018 for the offence
punishable under Sections 302/120(B) of the Indian Penal Code
and 27 of Arms Act.

The allegation against the petitioner in First
Information Report that on 18.11.2018, the husband of the
informant had informed that one Vijay Baba has called him and
he would be coming after some time. It has further been alleged
that said Vijay Baba had taken loan of Rs. 4 lakhs from the
husband of the informant. After one hour, the informant got
information that her husband was seen going near the Gangas
river with Vijay Babda and as well as the petitioner, i.e., Pintu



Singh on a black colour Honda Syne vehicle. It has further been alleged that the petitioner, Pintu Singh, had also taken loan of Rs. 7 lakhs and 3 lakhs from the informant's husband (deceased) for the purpose of her sister's marriage. It has also been alleged that informant got information at about 6.30 P.M. on the same date that Pintu Singh, i.e., petitioner and Vijay Baba and 2-3 others unknown persons had killed husband of the informant and the police had taken the dead body of the deceased.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner is named in the First Information Report but only suspicion has been raised against the petitioner and nobody has seen the occurrence.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the informant has not disclosed the source of information that from whom she has got this information that her husband was going with Vijay Baba along with the petitioner.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State after referring paragraph 18 and 19 of the case diary has submitted that the brother of the deceased as well as the informant have categorically stated that petitioner has taken loan from the deceased and this was the reason behind killing of the informant's husband.



After having heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State and taking into consideration the fact that petitioner is named in the First Information Report and further the informant as well as brother of the deceased have disclosed the name of petitioner as one of the persons responsible for the murder of informant's husband. Accordingly, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the same is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

sanjeev/-

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

