

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39407 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-343 Year-2018 Thana- LAKHISARAI District- Lakhisarai

Chand Govind Ray @ Shri Chand Govind Ray, Son of Late Raja Ram Ray,
Resident of - Jaganathpur Lal Mohalla - Ward No. 87, P.S.- Dhurwa, Distt –
Ranchi. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Amit Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Upendra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

2 27-06-2019 Heard both sides.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Lakhisarai P.S.

Case No.343 of 2018 registered under Section 392 of the Indian
Penal Code.

The informant (driver of a maruti car bearing
Registration No.BR01DP-7004) disclosed that three persons
hired the car to go to Sheikhpura. When the informant
proceeded ahead of Sheikhpura, the accused persons asked the
informant to stop the car and thereafter at the point of pistol
snatched his purse, Aadhar Card, mobile etc. and fled away with
the said car.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. One Dharmendra Kumar
was arrested from the house of the petitioner. Dharmendra
Kumar happens to be the son-in-law of the petitioner and police



recovered the car and other looted articles. It is further submitted that the petitioner is a witness of the seizure list. Dharmendra Kumar did not even name the petitioner. The petitioner has no complicity in committing robbery of the car. It is further submitted that two other accused persons, whose names figured in the confessional statement of Dharmendra Kumar, have already been granted anticipatory bail by order dated 21.01.2019 passed in Cr. Misc.No.67574 of 2018. The case of the petitioner stands on better footing, but it appears that of course the petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. but the petitioner happens to be the father-in-law of the co-accused Dharmendra Kumar, who was arrested from the house of the petitioner. The police found the car in front of the house of petitioner and car along with other looted articles were recovered from there. During course of investigation, the complicity of petitioner has also come with his son-in-law in such crime.

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

Harish/-

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

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

