

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4254 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-466 Year-2018 Thana- DANAPUR District- Patna

-
-
1. Raj Mangal Singh Son of Late Mukeshwar Singh Resident of Village - New Gosai Tola, Gola Road, Near Dr. D. Ram, D.A.V Public School, P.S.- Danapur, Distt.- Patna.
 2. Utakarsh Kumar @ Utkarsh Kumar Singh Son of Sri Krishna Singh @ Ravi Ranjan Singh Resident of Village - New Gosai Tola, Gola Road, Near Dr. D. Ram, D.A.V Public School, P.S.- Danapur, Distt.- Patna.
 3. Ujjawal Kumar Son of Sri Krishna Singh @ Ravi Ranjan Singh Resident of Village - New Gosai Tola, Gola Road, Near Dr. D. Ram, D.A.V Public School, P.S.- Danapur, Distt.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Sanjay Kumar Son of Late Ram Prakash Sharma Resident of Village - G0oyai, P.O.- Karorja, P.s.- Naubatpur, Distt.- Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, Senior Advocate Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Arun Kumar Singh, A.P.P.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Rakesh Narain Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 19-02-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned A.P.P. for the State as well as learned counsel for the Informant.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Danapur P.S. Case No. 466 of 2018 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 406, 468/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

This anticipatory bail application has been filed for the second time inasmuch as earlier the anticipatory bail



application of the petitioners have been rejected by this Court vide order dated 12.07.2019 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 16418 of 2019.

Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of petitioners submits that the anticipatory bail application of the co-accused namely Peyari Devi and Priya Kumari have been allowed by this Court taking into consideration the fact that the petitioners therein have deposited a sum of Rs.18 lacs in favour of the informant. Learned senior counsel further submits that son of Peyari Devi namely Aditya Kumar has been enlarged on regular bail vide order dated 09.08.2019 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 36033 of 2019 with a condition that he shall deposit entire admitted amount of Rs.18 lacs in three equal installments within a period of three months and he has refunded the aforesaid amount to the informant. He further submits that similarly on this ground anticipatory bail of other co-accused Peyari Devi and Priya Kumari have been allowed by this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 59272 of 2019 and Cr. Misc. No. 18355 of 2019. He further submits that entire Rs.18 lacs have been refunded in favour of the informant which was given by the informant in favour of the petitioners and his family members.

On the other hand Mr. Rakesh Narain Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of informant vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that from



perusal of Annexure-A of the counter affidavit which has been filed in this anticipatory bail application, it would be evident that a total amount of Rs.36,51,000/- has been paid by the informant in favour of the petitioners and other family members for purchase of a house owned by the wife of the petitioner no.1 situated at Thana No. 21, Tauji No. 5138, Khata No. 71, Plot No. 1305 measuring 1341.625 square feet at mauja Danapur Shahjadpur. He further submits that the order of rejection of bail application passed by this Court earlier is well reasoned and there is no question for re-consideration of anticipatory bail application of the petitioners in second attempt.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that there is no fresh ground for re-consideration of the anticipatory bail application of the petitioners which was rejected earlier by this Court vide order dated 12.07.2019 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 16418 of 2019, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to these petitioners and the same is hereby rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

mdrashid/-

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

