

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63859 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-123 Year-2020 Thana- PIRO District- Bhojpur

=====

Amarjeet Prakash Singh Son Of Ramkrishna Singh Resident Of Village -
Rajapur, P.S. - Piro, District - Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/S

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Harendra Prasad

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 18-07-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in
a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341,
323, 504, 506, 379, 307 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that the petitioner assaulted Sushil Kumar with iron rod
causing injury on head.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. From
perusal of the impugned order, it would manifest that one of the
injuries of the injured is simple in nature and with regard to the
second injury, the opinion is reserved.



The learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that there is a direct allegation against this petitioner of assaulting by an iron rod on the vital part of the body of the father of the informant i.e. head. It is also submitted that since the opinion has been reserved that amply demonstrates that the injury is not simple or else as has been recorded with respect to injury no.1 that it is simple, the same finding would have been also recorded with respect to injury no.2, but in absence of the same, the presumption is that the injury is not simple and it is not in dispute that the injury is on the vital part of the body.

Considering the submissions made by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

