

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4920 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-145 Year-2022 Thana- MIRGANJ District- Gopalganj

RAVI RAM @ RAVI KUMAR RAM Son of Kamlesh Ram R/v- Gaurup  
Samail, P.S.- Mirganj, District- Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                       |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr. Avinash Kumar     |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr. Uday Pratap Singh |
|                          | : | Mr. Vyas Kumar Mishra |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      05-05-2023                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
APP for the State assisted by learned counsel for the informant.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Section 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code pending in the learned court below.

As per the prosecution case, informant alleged that the deceased who was nephew of the informant gone together with accused Satyam Dubey and Ravi Ram but when late night not came to home then informant called him on his mobile then deceased Varun Tiwari said he was in his village. Thereafter, he was slept but at 11:45 P.M., Satyam Dubey and Ravi Ram came at the door of informant and said his nephew has sustained gunshot injury, after that when informant gone to see he found his nephew lying dead. Hence, the F.I.R.



Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that the occurrence took place on 05.05.2022 at 11:55 PM but the FIR lodged on 06.05.2022 9:30 AM i.e. after delay of more than 9 hours which creates serious doubt about the veracity of the prosecution case. He submits that there is no eye witness in the present case. He further submits that petitioner has got no criminal antecedent as stated in para-3 of the bail application.

Per contra, learned APP for the State assisted by learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposing the bail application and submits that the petitioner has suppressed his criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-19 of the case diary. Hence, he does not deserve anticipatory bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that petitioner has suppressed his criminal antecedent, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail in connection with Mirganj P.S. Case No. 145/2022. Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

**(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)**

ajay/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

