

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.46903 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-208 Year-2021 Thana- PANAPUR District- Saran

1. SONU KUMAR SINGH @ SONU SINGH Son of Satya Prakash Singh @ Gulli Singh (at Sl. No.3) Resident of Village - Rampurudh, P.s.- Panapur, Distt.- Saran.
2. SANJAY SINGH Son of Late Lalbabu Singh (at Sl. No.9) Resident of Village - Rampurudh, P.s.- Panapur, Distt.- Saran.
3. RAJAN SINGH @ RAJAN KUMAR Son of Late Mani Singh (at Sl. No.11) Resident of Village - Rampurudh, P.s.- Panapur, Distt.- Saran.
4. SUSHANT SINGH @ BABLOO SINGH @ SUSHANT KUMAR Son of Dharmendra Singh (at Sl. No.14) Resident of Village - Rampurudh, P.s.- Panapur, Distt.- Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Vinod Shanker Modi, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 23-11-2022 Learned counsel for the petitioners is permitted to remove the defects, as pointed out by the office, if any, within a period of four weeks from today.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State.

The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 448, 323, 324, 307, 435, 427, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

The petitioners and others are alleged to have opened



fire upon the informant and fled away after hurling abuses.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner no. 1 has clean antecedents whereas petitioner nos. 2, 3 and 4 carry one more case other than the present one and they have been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that it appears from the F.I.R. itself that there is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioners and no specific allegation of firing is attributed to them rather the specific allegation of firing is attributed to the co-accused, Alok Singh and Satyaprakash Singh. He further submits that according to the injury report, which are annexed as Annexures-2 and 3, injuries sustained by the injured are said to be simple in nature. Hence, the petitioners may be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, let the petitioners, above named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Court below where the case is pending in connection with Panapur P.S. Case No. 208 of 2021, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal



Procedure and with other following conditions :-

(1) Petitioners 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 their absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, their bail bonds shall be cancelled by the Court below.

(2) If the petitioners tamper with the evidence or the witness, 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 petitioners and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioners have concealed their criminal antecedents, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioners. 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)

Ibrar//-

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

