

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28936 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-338 Year-2020 Thana- SANDESH District- Bhojpur

=====

ARJUN KUMAR SINGH @ ARJUN SINGH Son of Late Ram Lakhan Singh
Resident of Village - Dharasmpur, P.s.- Sandesh, Distt.- Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mayuri

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. J.N. Thakur

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 29-01-2022 Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to remove all
the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within one month.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned
APP for the State through video conferencing.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Sandesh P.S. Case No. 338 of 2020, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 447, 448, 504, 506 and 307
of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 read with Section 27 of the Arms Act.

The victim, Kanchan Devi, lodged her *fardbeyan* in
injured condition that all the four accused persons named in the FIR
including the present petitioner entered into her house and they made
pressure upon the victim to withdraw the earlier case. They wanted to
obtain the signature of the victim on a blank paper and when she did
not become ready the present petitioner fired shot by pistol which hit



at the temporal region of the victim. She was referred to PMCH, Patna.

There is direct allegation against the present petitioner that he fired shot by his pistol which hit at temporal region of the victim.

The learned Sessions Judge, Bhojpur, Ara has mentioned in his order that the accused persons including the present petitioner always teased and misbehaved with the victim/informant and wanted to establish illicit relation with her. On account of that a complaint was filed by the victim at the police station concerned and, thereafter, on the alleged date and time of the occurrence present petitioner and other co-accused persons entered into the house of the victim and asked her to sign on blank paper. It appears that petitioner and other accused persons are also tempering with evidence of the case lodged earlier against the petitioner and other accused persons.

In these circumstances, the petitioner is not entitled for the privileges of anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioner within the stipulated time provided in para-1 hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey , J)

SONALI/-

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

