

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.66796 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-112 Year-2021 Thana- BEGUSARAI MUFFASIL District-
Begusarai

=====

RAJNISH SINGH Son of Late Ram Kahin Singh Resident of - Ward No.- 2,
Ramdiri Nakti, Ramdiri, P.S.- Ramdiri, District - Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. S. K. Lal
	:	Mr.Pritish Kumar Lal
For the Opposite Party	:	Mr.Md. Ataur Rahman
For the Opposite Party No.8	:	Mr. Sandip Kumar Gautam
For the Opposite Party No.4	:	Mr. Madhav Kumar
For the informant	:	Mr. Binod Gautam

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

10 14-02-2023 Learned counsel for the petitioner filed a
supplementary affidavit in the court today.

Let it be kept on the record.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to
remove the defects within three weeks.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case
registered for the offence punishable under Sections 324, 307,
384, 447, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27
of the Arms Act pending in the learned court below.

As per the prosecution case, all the accused persons



came at the house of the informant and demanded money. Thereafter, all the accused persons including petitioner had gone & shot her son near *paspura dhala*.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that there is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner. He submits that there is no eye witness in the present case only on suspicion the petitioner have made accused in this case. He further submits that the injury report does not support the prosecution case because there are only two injuries and allegation against the petitioner is that he along with others co-accused persons have fired upon the injured person. He further submits that petitioner has got no criminal antecedent as stated in para-3 of the bail application but later on in his supplementary affidavit he submits that petitioner has got five criminal antecedent as stated para-3 of the supplementary affidavit.

Learned APP for the State along with learned counsel for informant opposes for prayer for bail and submits that earlier the petitioner has suppressed this fact that petitioner have five criminal antecedent. Hence, he does not deserve anticipatory bail.



Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and the fact that there is fire arm injury upon the injured person, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No.112/2021.

Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

ajay/-

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

