

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16413 of 2020**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-434 Year-2017 Thana- RAMPUR District- Gaya

NANDU YADAV Son of Dadu Yadav, Resident of Village - Gewal Bigha,
Bathan, P.O.- Samir Takya, P.S.- Rampur, Dist.- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Satya Veer, Adv.

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

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER**

2 05-03-2021 Heard both sides.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Rampur P.S.
Case No.434 of 2017 registered under Sections 307, 427, 506
and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and under Section 27 of the
Arms Act as well as under Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Explosive
Substances Act.

The informant alleged that on the date of occurrence
he was sleeping in his room situated in upper floor but suddenly
heard the sound of firing. The informant woke up. Some piece
of glass fell on his face. A bomb was also found in the room
but the same did not explode. The informant and his family
members came on verandah and raised alarm. The informant
saw the petitioner and others fleeing away by firing.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on



account of previous enmity, the petitioner has falsely been implicated. The unexploded bomb was recovered and seized from the house of the informant. It is submitted that the informant and petitioner are on litigating term and that is why the petitioner has been implicated in the case, but it appears that Satish (cousin of the informant) was killed for which Civil Line P.S. Case No.118 of 2011 was registered. The accused persons of Civil Line P.S. Case No.118 of 2011 were pressurizing the informant and others to compromise the case. When the informant did not agree, the petitioner and others made an attempt to kill the informant and others for which Rampur P.S. Case No.420 of 2017 was registered under Section 307 and other sections of the I.P.C. The petitioner is also an accused in a case registered under different sections of the Excise Act.

Having considered the facts aforesaid and the nature of allegations made against the petitioner and the fact that the petitioner has got criminal antecedent, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

Harish/-

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

