

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.37335 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-30 Year-2023 Thana- MAHARAJGANJ District- Siwan

1. AMARJEET KUMAR S/O MUNNI LAL MAHTO @ MUNI LAL MAHATO R/O Village- Kasdewara Preman Tola, PS. Maharajganj, Dist. Siwan
2. SHYAM KUMAR S/O MUNNI LAL MAHTO @ MUNI LAL MAHATO R/O Village- Kasdewara Preman Tola, PS. Maharajganj, Dist. Siwan

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bijay Prakash Singh  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sangeeta Sharma

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

2      31-07-2023                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 324, 342, 307, 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The informant alleges that accused persons including the petitioner came at his bathan where his son had gone to sleep, thereafter, Shyam and Amarjit inflicted knife blow on abdomen, neck and hand of his son causing injury, thereafter, Suganti and Madhuri caught his son and asked the accused persons to kill him but on intervention of Guddu, they fled and the injured was taken to the hospital.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case on account of earlier dispute.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that from perusal of pleadings made at Para 7, it would manifest that the injury caused to the son of the informant is a sharp cut injury and there are three stab wounds and the opinion has been kept reserve and the petitioners are alleged to have assaulted his son by knife.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

**8. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioners stands rejected.**

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

HarshPandey/-

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

