

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13290 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-339 Year-2020 Thana- BARH District- Patna

1. LAXMI DEVI W/o Sri Jugal Singh Resident of Village- Budhanpur, P.S.- Barh, District- Patna.
2. Jugal Singh S/o Late Ram Janam Singh Resident of Village- Budhanpur, P.S.- Barh, District- Patna.
3. Dheeraj Singh S/o Sri Jugal Singh Resident of Village- Budhanpur, P.S.- Barh, District- Patna.
4. Manoranjan Singh S/o Sri Jugal Singh Resident of Village- Budhanpur, P.S.- Barh, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Chandra Sen Prasad Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pranav Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

4 10-03-2022 In view of the order dated 21.01.2022, the application of petitioner no.2 Jugal Singh is dismissed as withdrawn.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner nos. 1, 3 and 4 and learned counsel for the State.

The petitioners apprehend arrest in connection with Barh P.S. Case No. 339 of 2020 registered under Sections 341, 323, 307, 325 and 379 of the I.P.C.

Submission of learned counsel for the petitioners is that petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in the present case due to previous enmity. Further he submits that



petitioners and accused persons are *neighbour* and *gotia*. There is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioners.

Learned A.P.P. appearing on behalf of the State opposed the prayer of the petitioners by contending that in the first information report, there is direct allegation of assault by means of *lathi* and *rod*, as a result of which brother of the informant sustained injuries. The injury report also corroborates the same. Hence, this is not a fit case for anticipatory bail.

Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and nature of the allegation as well as the submission advanced on behalf of the learned counsel for the State, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Accordingly, prayer of the petitioner nos. 1, 3 and 4 is rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

shailendra/-

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

