

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64414 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-177 Year-2020 Thana- TATARPUR District- Bhagalpur

1. MANISH KUMAR @ MANISH RAM S/O RANJIT RAM R/o village- Rikabganj, P.S.- Tatarpur, District- Bhagalpur
2. Raj Kumar @ Raja Ram S/o Raju Ram R/o village- Rikabganj, P.S.- Tatarpur, District- Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abdul Wadood, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pranav Kumar, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER**

2 19-07-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Tatarpur P.S. Case No. 177 of 2020 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 324, 326, 354 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that in the evening, he along with his wife had gone to shop of Raja Ram for purchasing eggs where Manish Ram and Gholti Ram were standing in an intoxicated condition and after seeing his wife they started commenting and taunting, it is next



alleged that Raja Ram started delaying in giving the eggs and when the informant asked about delay, the accused started assaulting him. Manish and Gholti started misbehaving with his wife and thereafter Gholti Ram gave orders to Raja Ram to set the informant ablaze by pouring petrol so that they can enjoy with his wife, on which Raja Ram poured petrol on the informant and Manish Ram provided match-stick to Raja Ram who set him ablaze, it is next alleged that informant received burn injuries and was taken to the hospital for treatment.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case, the allegation does not inspire confidence as Raja Ram is a businessman and the informant had gone to his shop for purchasing eggs and no shopkeeper would try to bring disrepute to his business by behaving in such a manner, it is next submitted that even Manish Ram who was standing there came to be falsely implicated in the present case.

Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR it would manifest that the informant is a disabled person and it appears that since he was with his wife as such the accused persons started harassing her



and when he objected the present occurrence was committed.

Considering the submissions made by the learned APP
for the State, the Court is not inclined to grant privilege of
anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Their prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Shivam/-

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

