

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35928 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-170 Year-2022 Thana- BHAGALPUR KOTWALI District-
Bhagalpur

-
-
1. Anand Yadav Son Of Kaila Yadav Resident Of Rautara, P.S. - Rautara,
District - Katihar
 2. Raju Yadav Son Of Lalan Yadav Resident Of Rautara, P.S. - Rautara, District
- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjeev Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Mithlesh Kumar Khare, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

4 18-09-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
APP for the State.

2. In the present case, the petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Kotwali (Jogsar) P.S. Case No. 170 of 2022, registered on 23.02.2022 for the offences under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, unknown miscreants snatched the bag of the informant in which he has kept Rs.Five lakhs withdrawn from the bank. The bag also contained the lock and key of the house, the passbooks of the informant and his wife, cheque book and fixed deposit receipt. The name of the petitioners transpired during investigation for being involved in the said case.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that



the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioners are not named in the FIR and there is no specific allegation of snatching bag from the possession of the informant. The petitioners are having clean antecedent

5. Learned APP opposes the submission made on behalf of the petitioners. Learned APP submits that during investigation police found the presence of mobile number of petitioner no. 1 at the spot and the said mobile was seized. Further, seizure of the amount of Rs.2,50,000/- (Two lakhs Fifty thousand) and the passbooks of the informant and his wife was made from the house of petitioner no. 2 Raju Yadav. The statement of witnesses have also been recorded wherein the witnesses have stated about altercation taking place between the petitioners and other co-accused persons over distribution of the looted money.

6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances and submission, I do not think it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail and hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is rejected.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

DKS/-

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

