

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35754 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-34 Year-2020 Thana- SAHEBGANJ District- Muzaffarpur

Ganesh Sahni Son Of Late Naga Sahni Resident Of Village - Bairiya, P.S.-
Sahebganj, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Priyesh Kumar
For the State : Mr.Umesh Lal Verma

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

2 29-11-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 149, 341, 342, 323, 324, 307, 353, 504 of the Indian Penal Code.

It is alleged that when the police officials went to the house of co-accused Naresh Sahni for raid, all the F.I.R named accused persons and 30-40 unknown have attacked on the police officials and thereby obstructed the police officials in discharge of their official duties.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the



petitioner that petitioner was not apprehended from the spot. Nothing incriminating has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. The petitioner has been made accused in this case only because he is brother of co-accused Naresh Sahni. A statement has been made in para 3 of the petition that petitioner is accused in one other case apart from the present one.

In contra, learned A.P.P appearing on behalf of the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submitted that there is direct allegation of assaulting to the police officials against the petitioner. Moreover, the petitioner has wrongly mentioned in para 3 of the petition that he is accused in only one case apart from the present one. In fact, petitioner is accused in six other cases. The relevant documents in this regard has been produced before this Court. Let it be kept on the record.

Considering the fact that petitioner has criminal antecedents of more than five cases, this Court is not



inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner stands rejected.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

Shageer/-

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

