

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29553 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-464 Year-2023 Thana- HARSIDHI District- East Champaran

1. Madan Singh Son of Jai Narayan Singh (wrongly mentioned as 40 years in the F.I.R.), R/o Village- Olahan, P.S.- Harsidhi, District- East Champaran
2. Akash Singh Son of Madan Singh R/o Village- Olahan, P.S.- Harsidhi, District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Krishna Kant Singh, Advocate
for the Informant	:	Mr. Abhishek Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Hemant Ray, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Satya Nand Shukla, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

3 16-12-2024 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Harsidhi P.S. Case No. 464 of 2023, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 307, 302, 504/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per allegation, the specific allegation against the petitioners and co-accused, Durgesh Singh is that they opened indiscriminate firing on the deceased at the order of co-accused, Brijbihari Singh sustaining injuries husband of the informant died at the spot.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted



that the petitioners are a person of clean antecedent and have falsely been implicated in this case. The entire family members have been alleged as accused in this case. He has also submitted that three injuries were found on the deceased.

5. Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant have opposed the bail by submitting that the petitioners are the main assailants and multiple injuries of fire-arm has been found on the dead body as well as the postmortem report.

6. Learned APP, Mr. Satya Nand Sukla has also submitted submitted that three anti cartridge were recovered from the place of occurrence.

7. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioners are not entitled for privilege of anticipatory bail. Their prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Guddu/-

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

