

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14803 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-376 Year-2019 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

SHATRUGHAN PANJIYAR @ SHATUGHAN PANJIYAR Son of Arjun Panjiyar Resident of Village- Bharehwa, P.S.- Runnisaidpur, District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Mishra, Advocate.

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

4 13-10-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State through virtual Court proceedings.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Runnisaidpur P.S. Case No. 376 of 2019 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 307, 506 & 447/34 of the Indian Penal Code pending in the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sitamarhi.

The prosecution case, in brief, is that co-accused Satrughan Panjiyar called the informant's husband through mobile phone for a pachayati and when the informant and her husband opened the door of the house, the petitioner and co-accused Arjun Panjiyar and Ravindra Panjiyar entered into their house and the petitioner tried to carry the informant's



husband to his house and on protest made by the informant's husband, the petitioner stabbed with a knife below the chest in the left side of abdomen of informant's husband and there was profuse bleeding. When the informant made a noise, the petitioner and co-accused ran away and the informant took his husband to Runnisaidpur P.H.C. from where he was referred to S.K.M.C.H., Muzaffarpur but seeing the critical condition of the informant's husband he was admitted at R.B.M. Hospital, Muzaffarpur.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that no such occurrence as alleged ever took place. He has been falsely implicated in this case due to previous enmity. No case under Section 307 IPC is made out against the petitioner. It is further submitted that the parties to the case has compromised the matter outside the Court and a compromise petition has also been filed in this regard. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

Learned APP for the State vehemently opposing the bail petition submitted that there is direct allegation against the petitioner, hence he does not deserve anticipatory bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of case and from perusal of the case diary along with the treatment report, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.



The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the learned Court below within six weeks from today and seek regular bail and the learned Court below would pass order in accordance with law on the same very day without being prejudiced by this order.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Trivedi/-

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

