

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6932 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-209 Year-2018 Thana- SAHEBPUR KAMAL District-
Begusarai

=====

SHAILESH PANDIT @ SHAILESH KUMAR Son of Ram Nandan Pandit
Resident of Mohalla- Musechak, Bakhdda, P.S.- Sahebpur Kamal, Distt-
Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Abul Kalam

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.A.G.

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

3 27-01-2022 Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to remove all
the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within one month.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned
APP for the State through video conferencing.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Sahebpur Kamal P.S. Case No. 209 of 2018, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 452, 341, 307, 34 of the Indian
Penal Code and u/s 27 of Arms Act.

As per FIR lodged by Chhotu @ Nand Kishore Pandit, at
night about 11:50 pm when the informant was sleeping at his
varamdah, all of sudden the present petitioner and other named
accused persons entered into his house. They climbed on the chest of
the informant and after input of hard pressure they also fired gun shot



on his person. He was referred to the hospital. It has further been alleged that there was due of the informant to the present petitioner and the petitioner had also denied to make the payment of money.

From perusal of the case diary it appears that the investigating authority after finding the case true against accused persons, has submitted the charge sheet against co-accused persons bifurcating the case of the present petitioner as supplementary investigation was going on.

The injury report is also annexed as page No. 20 of the case diary which shows that the informant has sustained gun shot injury which is grievous in nature.

Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, it is not a fit case for anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, it is rejected.

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

