

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42121 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-377 Year-2016 Thana- FATUA
District- Patna

=====

=====

Ranjit Ray @ Ranjit Kumar Son of Late Kashi Ray Resident of
Village - Natthupur, Dumri, P.S.- Fatuha, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : : Mr. Jay Ram Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nirmal Kumar Sinha, A.P.P.

=====

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA

ORAL ORDER

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

learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State in the

Virtual Court proceeding.

Let the defects, as pointed out by the office, be
removed within a period of four weeks from today.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Section 353,
379 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

According to prosecution case, one Sri Mati Anita



Jaiswal S.D.P.O. Fatuha Patna, send a letter to S.H.O. of Fatuha Police Station, regarding lodging FIR and alleged therein that on 27.09.2016 Dumri Panchayat Natthupur Case No. 158 Ward No. 8, the Local Meeting Register and other papers are missing regarding that the Arti Kumari given a written letter. It is further alleged that who were mentioned in her letter are two persons namely Ranjit Ray and Dharmendra Paswan.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that it appears from the FIR that there is general and omnibus allegation against all villagers but there is specific allegation against the co-accused and the petitioner that they interrupted the holding of the selection process of the Anganwadi Savika. He further submits that there is nothing specific against this petitioner that action has been taken by the petitioner to obstruct the selection process.

Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State on the other hand vehemently opposed the prayer of the bail petition and submits that due to act of the petitioner



the selection process has not completed on its date.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of four weeks, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending in connection with Fatuha P.S. Case No. 377 of 2016, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. and also the following conditions:-

1. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

2. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.



3. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

sandeep/-

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

