

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19958 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-146 Year-2020 Thana- JADIA District- Supaul

RAHUL KUMAR SINGH SON OF SHIV KUMAR SINGH R/O GARHA,
WARD NO.-16, P.S.- SHANKARPUR, DISTRICT- MADHEPURA.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Satyendra Prasad, Adv.

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 13-01-2022 Heard the parties through virtual court proceedings.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case in connection with Jadiya P.S. Case No.146 of 2020, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 379/461 of the IPC.

The prosecution case in short is that theft has been committed in a school by some unknown thieves after breaking the lock and articles like LED TV55”, battery of Samsung and Crompton company, Invertor of Crompton company, amplifier, home theater Mack two pieces and one pen drive have been taken away.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. No such occurrence as alleged has ever taken place. He is not named in the FIR and has been falsely implicated in this case.



His name transpired in this case on the statement of one apprehended co-accused namely Shambhu Sah. During course of investigation, police has taken the LED TV Model No.KLV50W672G/2019 and serial no.810347 and seizure list has been made but the same is not the stolen LED TV, which is mentioned in the FIR. It is further submitted that police has not collected any cogent material against the petitioner. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent, as also mentioned in para-3 of this application.

Learned counsel for the State opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that on the confessional statement of the apprehended co-accused, some stolen articles have been recovered from the house of the petitioner, as such, he may not be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner named above. The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is hereby rejected.

Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

pallavi/-

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

