

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26864 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-138 Year-2020 Thana- JADIA District- Supaul

1. LILAY YADAV Son of Late Anand Yadav @ Anant Yadav Resident of Village - Manganj Paschim, Ward No. -03, Police Station - Jadia, District - Supaul.
2. Khatar Yadav Son of Lilay Yadav Resident of Village - Manganj Paschim, Ward No. -03, Police Station - Jadia, District - Supaul.
3. Mohan Yadav Son of Lilay Yadav Resident of Village - Manganj Paschim, Ward No. -03, Police Station - Jadia, District - Supaul.
4. Sukhnandan Yadav Son of Lilay Yadav Resident of Village - Manganj Paschim, Ward No. -03, Police Station - Jadia, District - Supaul.
5. Savita Devi Wife of Khatar Yadav Resident of Village - Manganj Paschim, Ward No. -03, Police Station - Jadia, District - Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arun
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anant Kumar 1

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

5 12-05-2022 Heard learned counsels for the petitioners and
the State.

Petitioners apprehend arrest in connection with
Jadia P.S. Case No. 138 of 2020 registered for the offence
punishable under sections 147, 149, 341, 323, 332, 333, 307,
353, 354, 354(B), 504, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners
submits that petitioners have not committed any offence as
alleged in the first information report and they have been

falsely implicated in this case. The allegations levelled are general and omnibus in nature.

Learned Addl. P.P. appearing for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that petitioners are named accused in the first information report and there is specific allegation against these petitioners of creating obstruction in official duty and assaulting the police personnel supported with the injury report. Petitioners, therefore, do not deserve to be granted the privilege of bail.

Considering the nature of allegations levelled, the materials available on record and the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. The same is, therefore, rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

mcv/-

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