

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10156 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-281 Year-2021 Thana- AHYAPUR District- Muzaffarpur

1. REKHA SINHA @ REKHA RANI SINGH W/O DR. YOGENDRA SINGH @ YOGENDRA SINGH @ DR. JOGENDRA SINGH R/v- Maharaja Nursing Home, Raghunathpur, P.S.- Turkauliya, District- East Champaran
2. DR.YOGENDRA SINGH @ YOGENDRA SINGH @ DR. JOGENDRA SINGH S/O RAM SURAT SINGH R/v- Maharaja Nursing Home, Raghunathpur, P.S.- Turkauliya, District- East Champaran
3. ABHIJEET KUMAR @ MINTU S/O ARVIND KUMAR R/v- Siuri Aima, P.S.- Saraiya, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Madhurendra Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Nitya Nand Tiwary
	Mr. Harshvardhan Shivsundaram

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

4 20-07-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned counsel for the informant as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Ahiyapur P.S. Case No.281 of 2021, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 342, 384, 323, 419, 420, 406, 467, 468, 120(B), 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The allegation against the petitioners is that, in conspiracy with other co-accused persons, they withdrew money from the bank account of the informant and also forcibly grabbed his



property and land.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioners are quite innocent and have committed no offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. No such occurrence, in the manner as alleged, has ever taken place. The allegation levelled against the petitioners is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. Petitioner no.1 is the daughter of the informant and petitioner nos.2 and 3 are the son-in-law and grandson of the informant. There is no specific overt act against the petitioners. He further submits that the allegation of execution of sale deed and withdrawal of money by fraud means is against the other co-accused persons. Petitioner no.2 has two criminal antecedent whereas petitioner nos.1 and 3 have no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail by submitting that the petitioners are also involved in the present case and there is ample of evidence against the petitioners in the case diary.

6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case as well as considering the nature of offence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail. The prayer for grant of



anticipatory bail on their behalf is hereby rejected.

7. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

shikha/-

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

