

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86723 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-113 Year-2019 Thana- KALYANPUR District- Samastipur

1. Sita Ram Ray @ Sita Ram Rai, aged about 35 years, male, Son of Ram Vilash Rai Resident of Village-Chhakkan Toli, P.S.-Kalyanpur, District-Samastipur.
2. Rohit Rai, aged about 30 years, male, Son of Niro Rai Resident of Village-Chhakkan Toli, P.S.-Kalyanpur, District-Samastipur.
3. Ram Babu Rai, aged about 45 years, male, Son of Late Maheshwar Rai Resident of Village-Chhakkan Toli, P.S.-Kalyanpur, District-Samastipur.
4. Raja Ram Rai, aged about 42 years, male, Son of Late Maheshwar Rai Resident of Village-Chhakkan Toli, P.S.-Kalyanpur, District-Samastipur.
5. Hira Rai, aged about 35 years, male, Son of Hari Rai Resident of Village-Chhakkan Toli, P.S.-Kalyanpur, District-Samastipur.
6. Madan Rai, aged about 36 years, male, Son of Suro Rai Resident of Village-Chhakkan Toli, P.S.-Kalyanpur, District-Samastipur.

... .. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioners	:	Ms. Kumari Vandana-Advocate
For the Opposite Party	:	Mr. Kanhaiya Kishore- A.P.P. 100

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

ORAL ORDER

2 14-02-2020 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Kalyanpur P. S. Case No.113 of 2019 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 302, 307, 323, 324, 337, 341 and 504 of the I.P.C.

3. The petitioners are named in the first information



report and there is specific allegation that they being member of unlawful assembly assaulted the deceased.

4. Although, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that no specific overt act has been attributed against the petitioners, but considering the above stated submissions and in the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the opinion that the petitioners do not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

5. Accordingly, their prayer for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

6. However, it is made clear that at the time of consideration of regular bail application, this order shall not cause any prejudice to the competent Court.

(Hemant Kumar Srivastava, J)

vikash

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

