

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18602 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-103 Year-2021 Thana- NOWKOTHI GARHPURA District-
Begusarai

=====

ANKIT KUMAR @ CHANCHAL KUMAR @ MUSANA son of Mukund
Kumar Singh Resident of Village - Pahasara, Police Station - Nawkothe,
District - Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pramod Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dr.Mrityunjaya Kr.Gautam, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 29-08-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

Let the defect(s), if any, as pointed out by the

office, be removed within four weeks.

The case is registered under sections 302/120-

B/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the

Explosive Substance Act, in connection with Nawkothe P.S.

Case No. 103 of 2021.

As per the prosecution story, the informant's son

had gone to attend 'Shardh' of Yugal Mahto and as he

returned and went to the local temple to put a lock on it,



around 10-15 accused persons arrived and assaulted him brutally. The informant upon knowledge went to the said place but by that time his son was killed. The informant has alleged that bomb was also exploded which proved fatal for his son. Thereafter, the accused persons fled from the place. The reason has been attributed that a day prior to the said case, one Guddu Singh was killed who had animosity with one Bambam Singh and the informant's son was the driver of the said Bambam Singh and as such he became the target of the other side.

In this case, case diary was called for on 27.7.2022.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that his name came in the confessional statement which do not have any value.

The learned APP after going through the various paragraphs of the FIR has submitted that the same has been supported during the course of the investigation and the further allegation is that not only his son was killed but his face was defaced and further the petitioner was also identified in the CCTV footage.

Considering the aforesaid allegation that has



been attributed to the petitioner, this Court for the present is not inclined to grant him the privilege of bail which is accordingly rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

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

