

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22654 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-274 Year-2021 Thana- BASOPATTI District- Madhubani

1. MD. JUMMAN MANSUR @ JUMAN MANSUR Son of Hasan Mansur Resident of Village - Janaki Nagar, P.S. - Basopatti, District - Madhubani (Bihar).
2. Tanveer Mansur @ Md. Tanveer Mansur Son of Md. Jumman Mansur @ Juman Mansur Resident of Village - Janaki Nagar, P.S. - Basopatti, District - Madhubani (Bihar).
3. Jibul Mansur @ Jiyabul Mansur son of Md. Jumman Mansur @ Juman Mansur Resident of Village - Janaki Nagar, P.S. - Basopatti, District - Madhubani (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Ravi Bhushan, Adv. Mr.Awadhesh Kumar Pandey, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Binod Kumar, APP Mr.Priyesh Kumar, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 26-09-2022 Heard the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioners undertakes to remove the defects within three weeks. In the eventuality of non-removal of defects within undertaken period, the office will place the matter before the Bench.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case in connection with Basopatti P.S. Case No.274 of 2021, registered for the offence punishable u/s 302/201/120(B) IPC.

Allegedly, son of the informant is said to have been killed by the F.I.R. named accused persons including the petitioners.



It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioners are quite innocent and have committed no offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case on suspicion. No such occurrence, in the manner as alleged has ever taken place. The allegation leveled against the petitioners is general and omnibus in nature. There is no eye-witness to the alleged occurrence and only on suspicion, petitioners have been made accused in this case. It is further submitted that there is no evidence to prove the allegations levelled against the petitioners. Petitioner no.1 has two criminal antecedent and petitioner nos.2 and 3 have one criminal antecedent.

Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail by submitting that there is specific allegation against the petitioners of threatening the informant's son to kill him.

Considering the nature of allegation, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail. The prayer for grant of bail on their behalf is rejected.

Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

pallavi/-

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

