

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.46985 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-168 Year-2023 Thana- TAJPUR District- Samastipur

Dinesh Ray S/O Sri Jawahar Ray R/O Village- Banbira, P.S- Tajpur, Distt.-  
Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mrs. Vaishnavi Singh, Advocate

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

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      23-08-2023                      Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the  
State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail, apprehending his arrest, in connection with Tajpur (Halai) P.S. Case No. 168 of 2023, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 324, 307, 302, 354B, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the FIR, it is alleged that all the accused persons including the petitioner killed the father of the informant by assaulting him with lathi, danda and iron rod.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that there is no specific allegation against the petitioner. The allegation against



the petitioner is omnibus and general. The specific allegation of assaulting the deceased on his head with iron rod is against co-accused Vijay Kumar.

5. It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the bail petition that the petitioner has not moved this Court earlier for anticipatory bail in this case.

6. It has further been stated in para 3 of the petition that earlier the petitioner is also made accused in other case.

7. However, the learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail submitting that the case is still at the stage of investigation and as per the postmortem report, the deceased died of injuries and there is allegation of assaulting the deceased against the petitioner also. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve to be enlarged on bail.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is not persuaded to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

9. The present application is rejected accordingly.

**(Jitendra Kumar, J)**

Amrendra/-

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

