

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72081 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-125 Year-2007 Thana- BHAGWANPUR District- Begusarai

Ranjan Tanti (Male – 45 years), S/o- Ramjee Tanti R/o Village- Bathauli, P.S.-
Barauni, District- Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shubhesh Pandey
For the Opposite Party/s : Md. Mushtaque Alam

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

6 14-07-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

In this case, the petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Bhagwanpur P.S. Case No. 125 of 2007 (G.R. No. 3039 of 2007) registered for offences under sections 341, 323, 353/34, 121, 22 of the Indian Penal Code along with $\frac{3}{4}$ of the Explosive Substance Act and Section 17/18 of the C.L.A. Act.

The prosecution case in short is that on 29.10.2007, the Informant was on duty on gate no.18B and, at about 2 PM, three persons came at the gate no. 18B. Their ages were ranging from 35 to 40 years. Out of three, one person was of fair complexion wearing long Pajama Kurta and other two were of medium height and were wearing trouser and shirt in which two



of them were having pistol in their hand and one person having bomb in his hand. The person, who was having pistol in his hand, assaulted the Informant and claiming themselves to be Maoist and asked him to inform Station Master to stop the train as they have to fix bomb at the Railway track. It has been alleged that all the three persons fitted the bomb at the Railway track and fled away from the spot after shouting and dropping printed paper mentioning slogan of Maowadi. By that time, the G.R.P. and R.P.F. as also the police came there and defused the bomb which were planted on the railway track.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the entire case diary, there is no material against the present petitioner and the case is still under investigation.

It is very much clear that the case was lodged in the year 2007 and, thus, the petitioner has no apprehension of arrest by the police. As learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no material against the petitioner, in that circumstances, there is no reason for this Court to exercise jurisdiction in favour of the petitioner after ten years of the occurrence though from different paragraphs of the case diary, the name of the petitioner has emerged in the present case.

Looking to the entire facts and circumstances of



the case, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner, above named, is rejected.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

rishi/-

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

