

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36422 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-18 Year-2019 Thana- MADHUBAN District- East Champaran

1. HRIDYA NARAIN PRASAD @ HIRDAY NARAIN PRASAD Son of Late Ramdev Bhagat Resident of Village - Gheghwa, P.S.- Madhuban, Distt - East Champaran.
2. Hariram Prasad Son of Late Rampreet Bhagat Resident of Village - Gheghwa, P.S.- Madhuban, Distt - East Champaran.
3. Ramanand Prasad Son of Hridya Narain Prasad @ Hirday Narain Resident of Village - Gheghwa, P.S.- Madhuban, Distt - East Champaran.
4. Manoj Kumar Son of Kishundev Prasad Resident of Village - Gheghwa, P.S.- Madhuban, Distt - East Champaran.
5. Ram Jeevan Prasad Son of Late Dangar Bhagat Resident of Village - Gheghwa, P.S.- Madhuban, Distt - East Champaran.
6. Lallan Prasad @ Lallan Kumar Son of Ram Jeevan Prasad Resident of Village - Gheghwa, P.S.- Madhuban, Distt - East Champaran.
7. Vinod Prasad @ Vinod Kumar Son of Kishun Dev Prasad Resident of Village - Gheghwa, P.S.- Madhuban, Distt - East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vinod Gautam

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rajiv Nayan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

2 26-06-2019 Heard learned counsels for the petitioners and the State.

Petitioners apprehend arrest in connection with Madhuban P.S. Case No. 18 of 2019 registered for the offence punishable under section 307 and other allied sections of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits



that petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case due to dirty village politics. The allegations are general and omnibus in nature. There is admitted land dispute between the parties.

Learned Addl. P.P. appearing for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioners and submits that there is active participation of these petitioners in the alleged occurrence which has resulted in several injuries to the informant and others. He, therefore submits that petitioners do not deserve to be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the nature of allegations levelled, the materials available on record and the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. The same is, therefore, rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

mcv/-

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

