

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49021 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-10 Year-2021 Thana- CHEWARA District- Sheikhpura

=====

LALLU YADAV S/O LATE BACHU YADAV Resident of village- Bhushri,
P.S.- Chewara, District- Sheikhpura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ranvijay Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.J.N.Thakur, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

2 11-01-2023 The learned counsel for the petitioner is directed

to remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter

within one month.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and

the learned APP for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest for the

offences alleged under Sections 447, 341, 323, 436, 504, 506,

390 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code registered in connection

with Chewara P.S.Case No. 10 of 2021.

As per allegation, the petitioner came to the

house of the informant on 19.01.2021. He was carrying a bottle

of liquor and one glass. He asked for water from the informant

and insisted to consume liquor at his place which was protested

by the informant, whereupon he started assaulting him. The

petitioner threatened to kill all the family members of the

informant by committing arson. On 21.01.2021, the petitioner

along with 4-5 unknown persons committed arson in the house



of the informant. The household articles were burnt to ashes.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the value of the articles burnt has not been mentioned in the FIR.

On the other hand, learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that the petitioner has committed arson in the house of the informant merely because he did not allow the petitioner to consume liquor at his place. In the supervision note, the investigating authority found the case true and witness in paragraph nos. 3, 7 and 8 have fully corroborated the occurrence.

In my view, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail, which is hereby rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioner within the stipulated time as provided hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/-

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

