

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22270 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-301 Year-2021 Thana- RAMPUR District- Gaya

=====

VEERU KUMAR S/o Jitendra Kumar @ Jitendra Prasad Resident of Village -  
Sarbahda, P.S. - Khizersarai, District - Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Sharma, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. A.G., A.P.P.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      03-11-2022                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 414, 420, 467, 468, 471, 472 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 25(1-B)a26/35 of Arms Act.

The informant alleges that on 13.09.2021 at about 11 pm, he received an information from the S.H.O. Chandauti, P.S., based on which a search was made in rental house of the petitioner and founds 9 live cartridges, 4 mobile phones, some key-rings of different motorcycles and various other things as detailed in the FIR from the room of the alleged house, it is next alleged that no document was produced by the apprehended accused Gunjan regarding received articles, further, Gunjan disclosed that the



seized items were brought by his elder brother that is the petitioner, it is next alleged that during investigation it also transpired that the house belongs to one Jitendra Yadav.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of two cases and has been falsely implicated in the present case, it is next submitted that the house belongs to Jitendra Yadav in which his brother was staying on for study and it appears that the articles were kept by his brother. Learned counsel next submits that the motorcycle which was seized is a purchased one.

Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the bail application and submits that the brother of the petitioner has specifically named the petitioner that the articles seized from the room belongs to him, as such, it is a case where the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the submission of the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

HarshPandey/-

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

