

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.363 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-97 Year-2022 Thana- SINGHWARA District- Darbhanga

1. PRADEEP SAHNI Son of Late Jagdeo Sahni Resident of Village - Sanahpur Bujurg, P.S.- Singhwara, District - Darbhanga.
2. Sanjeet Sahni @ Sanjeet Kumar Son of Pradeep Sahni Resident of Village - Sanahpur Bujurg, P.S.- Singhwara, District - Darbhanga.
3. Rupesh Sahni Son of Pradeep Sahni Resident of Village - Sanahpur Bujurg, P.S.- Singhwara, District - Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Arun Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Brajendra Nath Pandey, APP
	Mr. Pankaj Kumar Das, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 4 04-08-2023 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the State.
2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Singhwara P.S. Case No. 97 of 2022 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 307, 354(B), 380, 427 and 452 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners no.1 has antecedent of three cases, petitioner no.2 has antecedent of two cases and petitioner no.3 is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that accused persons came on 27.05.2022 and petitioner no.1 assaulted his father by



butt of pistol and thereafter Ranjit assaulted with an iron rod causing head injury, thereafter Ranjit assaulted him with *lathi*, further accused disrobed his wife and Bhujan Sahani took away cash Rs. 3,00,000/- and ornaments.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case, it is next submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR it would manifest that petitioner no.1 is alleged to have assaulted the father of the informant by butt of a pistol when allegation of assault by an iron rod is against Ranjit, it is next submitted that no specific allegation is alleged against petitioner nos.2 and 3.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel for the informant oppose the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and the learned counsel for the informant submits that petitioner no.1 is alleged to have assaulted the father of the informant, who was an old man, by butt of the pistol and the butt of the pistol is of iron and thereafter it is alleged that Ranjit assaulted him by an iron rod but then the father of the informant on account of assault went in coma and subsequently died, it is next submitted that the petitioner no.1 is a person with criminal antecedents also.



6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner no.1. His prayer for anticipatory is thus rejected.

7. However, as far as petitioner nos. 2 and 3 are concerned, they, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Singhwara P.S. Case No. 97 of 2022 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishi/-

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

