

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20206 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-215 Year-2022 Thana- PARSABAZAR District- Patna

=====

Vicky Kumar Sonof Ram Pravesh Singh Resident Of Village- Gayatri Nagar
Kurthaul, Ps- Parsa Bazar, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Yashraj Bardhan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shailendra Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 03-10-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Parsa Bazar P.S. Case No. 215 of 2022 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 34, 120B of the Indian Penal Code pending in the Court of learned ACJM-VIII, Patna.

3. As per the prosecution case, the brother of the informant left the house by stating that Pappu Kumar, Vicky Kumar had called him in order to give him money. With this message the brother of the informant left his house in the evening, later the informant came to hear the rumor that his brother had been done to death by means of strangulation and his dead body was lying at at Parsuramchak in a field.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. He submits that the deceased persons was a persons of criminal nature and he has been killed by his rivals, and the petitioner's name has been implicated only due to politics whilst the petitioner was not even in the city of Patna on the date of occurrence and he had no enmity or any type of quarrel with the deceased. He fairly submits that the process u/s 82 of the Cr.P.C. has been issued against the petitioner on 02.08.2023, but the stay was granted to the petitioner on 23.06.2023. The petitioner has four criminal antecedents as mentioned in para-3 of the bail application.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that the petitioner is also involved in the present case. Hence, he does not deserve privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the learned Court below within six weeks from today and seek regular bail,



the learned Court below would pass order on the same day in
accordance with law without being prejudiced by this order.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

anand/-

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

