

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5374 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-194 Year-2019 Thana- KOILWAR District- Bhojpur

=====

RANJAN KUMAR Son of Umesh Yadav @ Umesh Ray Resident of Village-
Manik Chak (Manachak), P.S.- Koilwar, District- Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Prabhat Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Amit Kumar Rakesh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 12-03-2021 Heard both sides.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Koilwar P.S.

Case No. 194 of 2019, registered for the offences punishable
under Sections 341, 323, 379, 307, 504, 506 and 384/34 of the
Indian Penal Code as well as Section 27 of Arms Act.

The informant alleged that he is driver of a truck
and his truck developed mechanical defect. He parked his truck
by the side of road near the garden of Lalaji. He was sleeping in
the said truck, in the meantime, 5-6 persons came near the truck.
The informant came out from the truck after hearing the sound
of accused persons. Thereafter, the accused persons entered into
the truck and took away Rs. 6,00/- kept on the dash board. They
also assaulted the informant and one of the accused fired
causing firearm injury in the knee of the informant. Thereafter,



they fled away. The villagers disclosed the name of Anil Yadav, Arun Yadav and Vinay Yadav

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. Name of the petitioner surfaced in the case in the confessional statement of Arun Yadav. It was Arun Yadav who is said to have fired causing injury in the knee of the informant. Save and except the fact that name of petitioner surfaced in the case in the confessional statement of co-accused, there is no other material to show the involvement of the petitioner but it appears that in the night accused persons looted the driver of the truck after causing him injury by firearms. The informant claimed to identify the miscreants, therefore, there is requirement of T.I.P.

Considering the facts aforesaid, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above named on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

rakhi/-

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

