

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.51669 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-310 Year-2022 Thana- SUPAUL District- Supaul

1. SUKHDEV THAKUR @ SUGDEV THAKUR S/o Late Tilam Thakur @ Tilai Thakur Resident of Village- Laurh, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul.
2. Chandrika Devi W/o Ranjit Thakur Resident of Village- Laurh, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul
3. Bechan Thakur S/o Sukhdev Thakur @ Sugdev Thakur Resident of Village- Laurh, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul
4. Jago Devi W/o Sukhdev Thakur @ Sugdev Thakur Resident of Village- Laurh, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul
5. Sanju Devi S/o Bechan Thakur Resident of Village- Laurh, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Patla Kumari

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sadanand Paswan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 13-12-2022 Larned counsel for the petitioner filed a
supplementary affidavit in the court today.

Let it be kept on the record.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioners undertakes to
remove the defects within three weeks. In the eventuality of
non-removal of defects within undertaken period, the office will
place the matter before the Bench.

The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in a case



registered for the offence punishable under Sections 366(A), 504, 323, 506, 120 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, Section 8 of POCSO Act and Section 3(I)(r)(s)(va) of the SC/ST Act pending in the Court of learned court below.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that statement of the victim was recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. in which she was not taken the name of the petitioner. He further submits that petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated in para-3 of this application.

Per contra, learned APP for the State vehemently opposing the bail petition submitted that the from the statement of the victim it is clear that one Suraj Kumar along with another five co-accused persons was present at the place of occurrence, hence they does not deserve anticipatory bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined the enlarge the petitioner on bail in connection with Supaul P.S. Case No.310/2022. Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

ajay/-

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

