

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59647 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-107 Year-2022 Thana- KALYANPUR District- Samastipur

1. UMESH PASWAN @ UMESH RAI SON OF NUNU PASWAN R/O VILLAGE- KHARSHAND, P.S.- KALYANPUR, DISTRICT- SAMASTIPUR
2. RAJANI DEVI WIFE OF UMESH PASWAN @ UMESH RAI R/O VILLAGE- KHARSHAND, P.S.- KALYANPUR, DISTRICT- SAMASTIPUR

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sunil Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Pranav Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

5 25-04-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Kalyanpur P.S. Case No.107 of 2022 registered under Sections 307 of the Indian Penal Code and other allied sections of the I.P.C. and Sections 30(a), 41(i)(ii), 47 of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise (Amendment) Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have committed no offence. They have falsely been implicated in this case. Nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioners. He further submits that no specific allegation is made against these



petitioners. The petitioners have got no criminal antecedent.

Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners stating that the petitioners and other accused persons are alleged to have assaulted the police personnel with lathi-danda and started brick batting and torn their uniform creating unlawful assembly while the police party raided the house of one Govind Paswan and recovered 05 litres country made liquor, on account of which, the police party got injuries. Moreover, the petitioners have created hindrance in discharging duties. Therefore, the petitioners do not deserve anticipatory bail.

Having considered the above facts and circumstances of the case as well as the nature of allegations made against the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, their prayer for bail is rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

Harish/-

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

