

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6678 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-235 Year-2021 Thana- BAHADURGANJ District- Kishanganj

SAUD SON OF KHAIRUL @ KHAIRULAH R/O VILLAGE- MALTOLA
KELABARI, P.S- DIGHALBANK, DISTRICT- KISHANGANJ

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajeev Ranjan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Narsingh Tanti

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

2 25-08-2022 The learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to

remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within

one month.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned counsel for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest for the

offences alleged under Sections 419, 420, 384, 385, 379 and 414

of the Indian Penal Code, registered in connection with

Bahadurganj P.S.Case No. 235 of 2021.

As per allegation made in the FIR when the informant

was going by his motor-cycle, some persons came there by a

four-wheeler. They apprised the informant that they were police

personnel. They assaulted the informant with slaps. They took

his mobile and Rs. 1000/- and forcibly got him seated in their

vehicle and one of their associates took the motor-cycle and

followed their vehicle. On hue and cry, the villagers intercepted

their vehicle. Two miscreants fled away and one was arrested



who disclosed his named as Md. Asik and also disclosed the name of the miscreants who fled away as Md. Saud, the present petitioner and Md. Taujib.

The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that he he was not arrested at the spot. Nothing was recovered from his possession and his name figured in the confessional statement of co-accused who was arrested at the spot.

It appears that the petitioner has two criminal antecedents of similar nature and on similar ground the anticipatory bail petition of co-accused Md. Toujib has been rejected by this Court, vide order passed in Cr.Misc. No.65161 of 2021.

In view of aforesaid, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail, which is hereby rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioner within the stipulated time as provided hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/-

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

