

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.34933 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-132 Year-2018 Thana- IMAMGANJ District- Gaya

=====

Anjani Pandey @ Rakesh Ranjan Son of Brajesh Pandey @ Brajesh Pathak
Resident of Village - Purussottam Pur, P.S.- Imamganj, District- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prabhat Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Asha Kumari, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 17-09-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP representing the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Imamganj P.S. Case No. 132 of 2018, registered under Sections 324, 307, 34 and 302 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

The allegation against the petitioner, as per FIR lodged by wife of the deceased, is that on the date of occurrence her husband was sitting at door of the house and she was spreading cloths on the roof, she saw that three persons from motorcycle arrived near the house of the informant, in which one person covering his face and two other persons, namely, Anjani Pandey and Raju Lal @ Rajeev Lal armed with revolver fired upon the husband of the informant, he sustained bullet



injury. It has further been alleged that the persons who was covering his face with a cloth was identified and inasmuch as his cloth fell down, the informant recognized him by face.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case inasmuch as there is land dispute between the parties and petitioner has unnecessarily been dragged in this case. He further submits that the petitioner is employee of postal department and on the date of occurrence, he was on duty and for the same a certificate has been issued by the Post Master of the post office dated 11.12.2018 (Annexure-2).

After having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the husband of the informant died during course of treatment and the petitioner is named in the FIR, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

S.Katyayan/-

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

