

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22226 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-530 Year-2023 Thana- DAUDNAGAR District- Aurangabad

Rajnish Kumar SON OF DHIRENDRA PASWAN RESIDENT OF
VILLAGE- KERA, PS- DAUDNAGAR, DISTT- AURANGABAD

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Aman Vishal, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Anurag Singh, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 22-04-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323,
120B, 307, 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent has been falsely
implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next
submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the
FIR it would manifest that the allegation of causing injury to the
injured by knife is against Chhotu Kumar and the petitioner is
alleged to have caught the hand of the injured along with
Sumesh Kumar. It is thus submitted that no overt act has been
alleged against the petitioner of causing knife injury to the



injured. It is also submitted that the injury suffered by the injured is simple in nature.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that though the petitioner is not alleged to have assaulted the deceased by knife causing injury, but then, have the petitioner along with Sumesh Kumar not present at the place of occurrence and would have caught the hand of the injured in that event Chhotu Kumar would not have failed involved to cause knife injury. It is also submitted that though the injury is simple in nature, but then, the Doctor has opined that it is dangerous to life as would manifest from the injury report (Annexure-2).

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

annpurna/-

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

