

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29903 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-93 Year-2010 Thana- AMAS District- Gaya

- 
1. Satyendra Singh @ Satyendra Kumar Singh SON OF BHUNESHWAR SINGH RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- JALWAR, PS- IMAMGANJ, DIST- GAYA
  2. NIRANJAN SINGH @ NIRANJAN KUMAR SINGH SON OF CHOOTTU SINGH RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- JALWAR, PS- IMAMGANJ, DIST- GAYA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

---

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Aryan Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Surendra Prasad Singh, APP.

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      03-07-2024              Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned  
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in Amas P.S.  
Case No. 93 of 2010 registered for the offences punishable  
under Sections 395, 397 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the FIR, the allegation against the petitioners is  
that they along with other co-accused persons looted truck of  
600 bags of flour and assaulted the informant and his brother  
from butt of pistol on their heads. One of the co-accused opened  
fire upon the informant's side, but it did not hit anyone.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners  
that the petitioners are quite innocent and they have committed



no offence. No such occurrence as alleged has ever taken place. No any looted article has been recovered from the physical possession of the petitioners. They 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. They have been made accused in the present case merely on suspicion. It is further submitted that both the petitioners are not present at the place of occurrence, as they are working in Surat. Petitioners have no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that there is specific allegation of looting loaded truck with 600 gms of flour against the petitioners. Hence, they do not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of case as well as the nature of offence, 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 |  |
|---|--|---|--|

