

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7606 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-215 Year-2019 Thana- BIDUPUR District- Vaishali

-
1. Sonu Kumar, S/o Umesh Rai, R/o Village- Ward No.11, Nanhkchak, Dilawar Gobardhan, P.S.- Bidupur, Distt- Vaishali (Bihar).
 2. Vinay Kumar Rai @ Binay Rai, S/o Ganesh Rai @ Ganeshi Rai, Resident of Village- Naurangpur, Parmanandpur, P.S.- Mahnar, Distt- Vaishali. (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vasant Vikas, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Akhileshwar Dayal, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 08-07-2020

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 Bidupur P.S. Case No.215 of 2019 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 323, 324, 307, 504, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, which is pending in the court of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vaishali at Hajipur.

The informant has alleged that his son Umesh Rai



sold some joint family property land. When the same was objected to by the informant, co-accused Umesh Rai and his wife Sudama Devi, grandson (petitioner no.1) and son-in-law (petitioner no.2) started hurling abuses and assaulting the informant.

Petitioners' counsel submits that specific allegation of giving rod blow is against Umesh Rai and not against these petitioners. The submission is of false implication based on land dispute.

Learned APP for the State, referring to the injuries sustained by the informant recorded in the order of rejection of the Sessions Judge, Vaishali, submits that four wounds have been found. It is also stated that several witnesses have consistently supported the occurrence.

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

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

PNM

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

