

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.57242 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-298 Year-2018 Thana- RAMKRISHNANAGAR District- Patna

PREM RAJ, Son of Lal Babu Prasad, Resident of Village-Sanjay Gandhi
Nagar, P.S.-Patrakarnagar, District-Patna, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Gajendra Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Manoj Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 12-09-2019 The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Ramkrishna Nagar P.S.Case No. 298 of 2018 registered under
Sections 120B, 201, 302 and 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegation against the petitioner, as per FIR, is that on the
date of occurrence i.e., on 09.08.2018, the deceased Uttam
Kumar asked the informant to accompany him to 90 Ft. Road
situated at Patna to bring a sum of Rs. 5 lacs which was due
from Manish Kumar and also to take a Alto Car from him which
was lying with said Manish Kumar. It has further been alleged
that Manish Kumar along with other accused persons including
the petitioner took the deceased Uttam Kumar at Jaganpura and
to some other place and in the meanwhile, one person i.e., Anish
Kumar along with three persons remained with the informant
who assaulted the informant with dagger with an intention to



kill him and in the meanwhile one person received a call and the informant over heard that caller said that Uttam Kumar has been killed and he exhorted that person to kill the informant also.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case and there is no material to connect the petitioner with this offence. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that at best the petitioner was last seen with the deceased and except that there is no material or injury report or the postmortem report has been brought on record by the prosecution.

After having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that petitioner is named accused and informant has stated that deceased was taken to some other place by the petitioner and other accused persons, accordingly, I am not inclined to grant of privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner as such the same is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

sujit/-

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

