

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17028 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-217 Year-2021 Thana- SAHEBGANJ District- Muzaffarpur

SHAMBHU SAH S/O PANNA LAL SAH R/o village- Pratap Patti, Ward No.  
10, P.S.- Sahebganj, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                              |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr. Kalyan Shankar, Advocate |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr. Shantanu Kumar, APP      |
| For the Informant        | : | Mr. Rakesh Ranjan, Advocate  |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      17-08-2022                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned  
counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to  
remove the defects, as pointed out by the office, within four  
weeks. In the eventuality of non-removal of defects within  
undertaken period, the office will place the matter before the  
Bench.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Sahebganj  
P.S. Case No.217 of 2021 registered for the offences punishable  
under Section 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

To settle the land dispute, when the son of the  
informant went to the house of the petitioner, the petitioner  
along with his son is said to have started hitting upon



informant's son with sharp edged knife and sustaining grievous injury he died.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that no such occurrence as alleged ever took place. He has been falsely implicated in this case due to land dispute. Both the parties are own agnates. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

Learned APP for the State assisted by learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposing the bail petition submitted that considering the nature of allegation levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve anticipatory bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

**(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)**

Trivedi/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

