

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.27424 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-68 Year-2023 Thana- UPHARA District- Aurangabad

Pappu Kumar SON OF RAJNATH YADAV Village -Khaira PS- Uphara
District- Aurangabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Santosh Kumar Pandey

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Raj Kishor Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 14-05-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Uphara P.S. Case No. 68 of 2023 dated 20.07.2023
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148,
149, 341, 323, 324, 307, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code
read with Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and has been falsely
implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further
submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the
F.I.R., it would manifest that ornamental allegation is alleged
against the petitioner that he also fired but then no one was
injured in the firing made by the petitioner, though, the brother
of the informant got injured by firearm injury, alleged to have
been fired by Ajit. It is also submitted that on account of dispute



in between the parties, both sides assaulted each other and the side of the informant assaulted the father of the petitioner brutally causing fracture of his hand. It is further submitted that petitioner is not alleged to have fired causing firearm injury to the injured.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that one person has received firearm injury, though, petitioner is not alleged to have caused the firearm injury, but then Ajit is alleged to have fired causing injury and petitioner along with others were also present at the place of occurrence which emboldened Ajit to commit the occurrence.

5. 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.

6. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

