

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.57266 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-13 Year-2023 Thana- JALALGARH District- Purnia

1. Md. Ijarat @ Md. Ejarat S/O Md. Muslim Resident Of Village Dihiya
Gidarmari, P.S. Jalalgarh, District-Purnea (Bihar)
2. Md. Akamal S/O Md. Muslim Resident Of Village Dihiya Gidarmari, P.S.
Jalalgarh, District-Purnea (Bihar)
3. Md. Saheb @ Saheb Ali S/O Md. Majid Resident Of Village Dihiya
Gidarmari, P.S. Jalalgarh, District-Purnea (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Madhav Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Priya Sharan Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 14-09-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 324, 307, 354(B), 406, 420 and 379/34 of the Indian Penal Code pending in the learned court below.

3. As per the prosecution case, Md. Muslim took the consideration money for execution of a piece of land in favour of the informant but had not executed the sale deed in favour of the informant. It is further alleged that Md. Muslim executed the said laid in favour of his daughter thereafter all the petitioners in furtherance with their common intention all over such land and



started cultivating the said land. When the informant made protest then they started pressing his neck with intention to kill him.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that the allegation of taking money for land is on co-accused, namely, Md. Muslim and not on the present petitioners. He submits that there is no specific overt act against the petitioners. He further submits that there is case and counter case between the parties. He further submits that petitioners have got no criminal antecedent as stated in para-3 of the bail application.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that petitioners also involved in this case. Hence, they do not deserve anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and the fact that petitioners are also involved in the present case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail in connection with Jalalgarh P.S. Case No.13/2023. Accordingly, their application for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

ajay/-

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

