

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49541 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-189 Year-2021 Thana- NOORSARAI District- Nalanda

=====

DHIRAJ PASWAN @ DHIRAJ KUMAR Son of Arjun Paswan Resident of
Village - Dumarawna, P.S.- Dipnagar, Distt.- Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Dr. Kumar Uday Pratap, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 28-06-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to remove the defects, as pointed out by the office, within four weeks. In the eventuality of non-removal of defects within undertaken period, the office will place the matter before the Bench.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Noorsarai P.S. Case No. 189 of 2021 registered for the offences punishable under Section 392 and 411 of the Indian Penal Code pending in the Court of learned C.J.M., Biharsharif, Nalanda.

The petitioner in association of other co-accused is said to have snatched the mobile phone of the informant on the point of pistol.



It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that no such occurrence as alleged ever took place. He has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused Raju Paswan, who was apprehended at the place of occurrence and has taken the name of the petitioner under the police pressure. It is further submitted that another F.I.R. bearing Noorsarai P.S. Case No.188/2021 has been lodged against the petitioner for the same occurrence in which he has been granted anticipatory bail. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature.

Learned APP for the State vehemently opposing the bail petition submitted that the petitioner's name has come in this case on the confessional statement of the co-accused who was apprehended at the spot. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Trivedi/-

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

