

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4871 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-295 Year-2019 Thana- HAJIPUR SADAR District- Vaishali

1. YOGENDRA RAY S/O DIPAN RAY R/o village- Panapur Langa, P.S.- Hajipur Sadar, District- Vaishali
2. RAVI RAY S/O DIPAN RAY R/o village- Panapur Langa, P.S.- Hajipur Sadar, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Manish Chandra Gandhi, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Humayou Ahmad Khan, APP.
	Mr. Brajesh Prasad Gupta, Adv.
	Mr. Santosh Kumar, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

4 08-01-2024 Heard learned counsels for the parties.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in Hajipur Sadar P.S. Case No. 295 of 2019 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 407, 420, 504, 506, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Allegedly, petitioner along with other co-accused persons are said to be involved in making the L.P. vehicle loaded with black piper disappear and later on, when the informant and others asked them about the reason for not lodging the FIR for missing of the alleged vehicle, they threatened the informant's side to kill.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners



that petitioners are quite innocent and have committed no offence. No such occurrence as alleged ever took place. Petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. The allegation levelled against the petitioners is totally false and based on concocted facts. There is previous enmity between the informant and Juman Rai, who is full brothers of the petitioners and being the full brothers, they have been made accused in the present case. It is further submitted that owner of the alleged vehicle Juman Rai has already filed complaint case for missing of his vehicle bearing Reg. No. BR1G-2267. Petitioners have no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail. It is submitted by learned counsel for the informant that there is serious allegation levelled against the petitioners that they told the informant the false fact regarding the theft of the vehicle and have not filed the FIR for missing of the alleged vehicle and when the informant and others asked them for the same, they threatened the informant's side of dire consequences.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case as well as arguments of the parties, I am not inclined to enlarge the



petitioners on bail. The prayer for bail of the petitioners is
hereby rejected.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

