

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2897 of 2020**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-80 Year-2019 Thana- DARPA District- East Champaran

-
1. Akhilesh Kumar Son of Ram Sowarath Prasad @ Ram Sowarath Ray
 2. Ram Sowarath Prasad @ Ram Sowarath Ray Son of Ramchandra Ray

Both resident of Village - Belahiya, P.S.- Darpa, District - East
Champaran.

... .. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Umesh Chandra Verma

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Satya Nand Shukla

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT KUMAR
SRIVASTAVA**

ORAL ORDER

2 28-02-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

Petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with
Darpa P.S. Case No. 80 of 2019 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 441, 442, 353, 186, 354, 506, 509, 34
of the Indian Penal Code.

The accusation against the petitioners is that they
pressurized the informant, who happens to be a government
official, not to do her work in accordance with law and also
pressurized her to write in proceeding book according to wish of
the petitioners.

Submission on behalf of the petitioners is that wife of



petitioner no. 1 was applicant for Sevika and she was selected but subsequently, the informant demanded gratification for appointment which was denied by the wife of petitioner no. 1 and thereafter, the informant lodged this false case against the petitioners as well as wife of petitioner no. 1. He further submits that wife of petitioner no. 1 lodged Darpa P.S. Case No. 116 of 2019 against the informant of the present case and others.

The facts of the case and submissions of the parties go to show that petitioners pressurized the informant to do illegal work and subsequently, wife of petitioner no. 1 lodged Darpa P.S. Case No. 116 of 2019 on 11.11.2019 i.e. after institution of the present case.

Regard being had to the above stated facts and circumstances as well as submissions of the parties, I am not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to petitioners and accordingly, their prayer for anticipatory bail stand rejected.

However, it is made clear that this order shall not cause any prejudice to concerned court at the time of consideration of regular bail application of the petitioners.

(Hemant Kumar Srivastava, J)

shahzad/-

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

