

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7200 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-89 Year-2019 Thana- LAUKAHI District- Madhubani

1. Mukesh Yadav @ Mukesh Kumar Yadav, Son of Late Yadunandan Yadav, Resident of Village - Dhabahi, P.S.- Laukahi, Distt - Madhubani.
2. Rajesh Yadav, Son of Late Yadunandan Yadav, Resident of Village - Dhabahi, P.S.- Laukahi, Distt - Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Hriday Narayan Harshit, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ajay Kumar Jha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

3 02-07-2020

Since as of now the Courts have not resumed normal physical hearing, the matter has been listed today for consideration through video conferencing.

The learned counsels are appearing and making submissions from their residence. The Court Master and Secretary are also part of this virtual Court proceedings from their homes, all with the aid of audio visual technology.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned APP for the State.

The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Laukahi P.S. Case No.89 of 2019, corresponding to G.R. No.677 of 2019, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 323, 324, 307, 379, 506, 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

It is alleged that while the grandson and grand-daughter of the informant were coming from wheat flour mill,



petitioners have assaulted them as also their father Binod Yadav.

Petitioners' counsel submits that there is case and counter case based on past animosity between the parties. Both sides have sustained injuries and it is a case of false implication.

Learned APP for the State referring to the order of rejection dated 10.12.2019 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Jhanjharpur has submitted that the allegation of assault is corroborated by the injury report which has recorded incised wound on vital part of the informant/victim.

Considering the rival submissions, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. It is, accordingly, rejected.

The court below, however, while considering the petitioners' prayer for regular bail shall not prejudice by the present order of rejection of the prayer for anticipatory bail.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

PNM

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

