

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43116 of 2019**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-71 Year-2019 Thana- GAMAHARIYA District- Madhepura

KESHAV KUMAR Son of Rameshwar Mehta @ Gohlan Resident of Village-
Tarabe, Police Station-Gamharia, District-Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. B. N. Pandey, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER**

2 12-07-2019 Heard both sides.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Gamharia P.S.
case No. 71 of 2019 registered under Section 384, 307 and some
other Sections of the IPC and u/s 27 of Arms Act.

The informant alleged that petitioner and others,
namely, Hemant Kumar and Rameshwar Mehta came to his
asbestos shop and took asbestos worth Rs. 50,000/- but paid
only Rs. 10,000/-. When the informant demanded remaining
price the petitioner exhorted and disclosed that they are
Rangdars and on such the accused persons made firing in which
mother of the informant got injuries.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no
specific allegation of firing is made against the petitioner.
Mother of informant got one lacerated cut injury on forehead



over right eye. It is submitted that no gun powder was found over the wound. It is further submitted that injury is opined to be caused by hard and blunt object but it appears that all the accused persons demanded extortion when the informant asked them to pay the price of asbestos and on such they made indiscriminate firing in which mother of the informant got one injury. Five empty cartridges were recovered from the place of occurrence. The petitioner has got criminal antecedent and he is accused in Gamharia P.S. case No. 92 of 2017 registered u/s 385, 354A and other Sections of the IPC and even the injury caused by pellet can be opined to be caused by hard and blunt object.

Taking into consideration the facts aforesaid, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

BKS/-

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

