

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10279 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-273 Year-2019 Thana- TARAIYA District- Saran

=====

RANJIT KUMAR @ COMMANDAR, son of Ram Pujan Prasad, resident of
Ward No. 14, Gudri Rai Ke Chowk, P.S. Bhagwan Bazar, District Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravi Bhushan Prasad Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 24-08-2020 Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned

Additional Public Prosecutor for the State, through video

conferencing.

This application, for grant of anticipatory bail, arises
out of Taraiya Police Station Case No. 273 of 2019, disclosing
offences under Sections 394 of the Indian Penal Code and
Sections 25(1-b)a/26/35 of the Arms Act.

The allegation against the petitioner is that the
petitioner, along with other accused persons, accosted the
informant and snatched a bag, containing silver ornaments and
when the people around the place of occurrence protested, the
co-accused took out a pistol and opened fire, in which one
shopkeeper got injured.



Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case on the basis of the confessional statement made by the arrested co-accused. He further submits that the petitioner is working in Delhi and he had come to see his ailing father and he has been implicated in this case at the behest of the co-accused.

On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that in course of investigation, it has come, in the case diary, that from the Call Data Record of the petitioner, it is evident that the petitioner had a talk with the co-accused, who has been apprehended and at the time of occurrence, the location of the mobile phone of the petitioner was near the place of occurrence. He further submits that two co-accused persons, in their confessional statements, have vividly explained the description of the occurrence. He further submits that the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Having regard to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the fact that as per the electronic evidence, the petitioner was found talking with the accused persons and in course of investigation, it has come to light that the location of the mobile of the petitioner was near



the place of occurrence, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner
privilege of anticipatory bail.

This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	√	T	√
---	---	---	---

