

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26339 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-645 Year-2023 Thana- BRAHMPUR District- Buxar

Aravind Kumar Gupta @ Aravind Jaysawal @ Aravind Prasad S/o Late
Bajjnath Prasad Resident of Village- Nimaj, P.S.- Brahmpur, District- Buxar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Gupta

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Nirmala Kumari

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 24-07-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Brahmpur P.S. Case No. 645 of 2023 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 481 and
120B of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent.

4. The informant alleges that petitioner's son namely
Sanjeev Kumar was made an accused in a case of N.D.P.S. Act
whereupon warrant of arrest was issued and when Jaipur police
reached to apprehend the accused, his family members, in order
to avoid arrest, produced the forged death certificate before
G.R.P., Jaipur.



5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case, it is next submitted that the petitioner had filed an application before the Block Development Officer for obtaining death certificate and the Block Development Officer, after holding a proper inquiry, issued the death certificate which was produced before the G.R.P., Jaipur, on which the learned APP for the State submits that B.D.O is not the competent authority for issuing death certificate. It is also submitted that the son of the petitioner is involved in a serious case of NDPS, as such, it appears that the petitioner deliberately obtained a death certificate from an authority who is not competent to issue the same.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

