

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24410 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-12 Year-2024 Thana- SHRIKRISHNAPURI District- Patna

1. Shambhu Nath Son of Late Sakaldev Pujari Resident of Mohalla- Dwarika Mandir Lane, Police Station- S.K. Puri, District-Patna
2. Ranjan Yadav @ Navin Kumar Son of Late Sakaldev Pujari Resident of Mohalla- Dwarika Mandir Lane, Police Station- S.K. Puri, District-Patna
3. Raju Kumar Son of Late Sakaldev Pujari Resident of Mohalla- Dwarika Mandir Lane, Police Station-S.K. Puri, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Akash Kumar Mishra, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Dilip Kumar No. 1, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Manish Kumar No. 2, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

7 02-12-2024 Heard Mr. Akash Kumar Mishra, learned counsel for the petitioners, Mr. Dilip Kumar No. 1, learned A.P.P. for the State and Mr. Manish Kumar No. 2, learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in Sri Krishnapuri P.S. Case No. 12 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 504, 427, 447, 385, 379, 406, 420/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, allegation against the petitioners is that they have demanded ransom form the informant.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case. The allegation levelled against the petitioners are not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. He submits that the said amount was not deposited in the petitioners' account, the said amount was deposited in account of other persons and they were not made accused in the present case. The said amount was deposited in the year 2019. He further submits that there is no specific overt act against the petitioners. The petitioners have two 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 and submitted that there are ample evidence against the petitioners in the case diary.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of case and the nature of the offence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

anand/-

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

