

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.45320 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-95 Year-2021 Thana- KATEYA District- Gopalganj

1. NANHAKU THAKUR S/o LATE SARAL THAKUR R/o VILLAGE-BELHIKHAS, P.S-KATEYA, DISTRICT-GOPALGANJ.
2. TUNTUN THAKUR S/o NANHAKU THAKUR R/o VILLAGE-BELHIKHAS, P.S-KATEYA, DISTRICT-GOPALGANJ.
3. PANKAJ THAKUR S/o NANHAKU THAKUR R/o VILLAGE-BELHIKHAS, P.S-KATEYA, DISTRICT-GOPALGANJ.

... .. Petitioners

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Harendra Prasad
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. A.G.

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

ORAL ORDER

2 13-04-2022 Learned counsel for the petitioners is directed to remove
all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within one month.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the
learned APP for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with
Kateya P.S. Case No. 95 of 2021, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 323, 325, 307, 504/34 of the Indian Penal
Code.

As per allegation, the informant who is poor and helpless
person, in his absence, the petitioners entered into his house abused
his daughter and badly assaulted her. When the informant came, they
also badly assaulted him and he got unconscious. When he regained



his consciousness he came to police station where from seeing the serious condition her daughter was referred to hospital.

Although, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that there is land dispute but there is nothing on the record which shows that there was land dispute between the parties. He has further submitted that the FIR has been lodged after five days of the occurrence and the petitioners are the persons of clean antecedents.

The petitioners in the absence of the informant entered into his house and badly assaulted his daughter, sustaining the injuries she was referred to the hospital.

In the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, the petitioners do not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, their prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioners 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	
---	--	---	--

