

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.41039 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-106 Year-2023 Thana- BHAGWANPUR District- Vaishali

Satendra Singh @ Satyendra Kumar Son of Vishun Dayal Singh R/O Vill.-
Ismailpur, P.S.- Goraul, Dist.- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajeev Ranjan No. II, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Madhura Nand Jha, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 20-11-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Bhagwanpur P.S. Case No. 106 of 2023, dated 26.04.2023 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 307, 504, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is also submitted that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that petitioner and his son took an amount of Rs. 8,45,000/- by way of advance



from the informant on pretext of selling their 10 *dhur* of land but the sale deed was never executed. Thereafter, the son of the petitioner namely Sonu Kumar gave a cheque of Rs. 8,25,000/- to the informant which got bounced, thereafter a legal notice was sent based on which again the petitioner and his son issued a cheque of Rs. 8,25,000/- and when the informant was coming back after collecting the cheque it is alleged that he was intercepted by accused persons including the petitioner and petitioner fired causing fire arm injury on his left hand.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it's absolutely does not stand to reason when petitioner had already issued a cheque of Rs. 8,25,000/-in favor of the informant after receiving legal notice where was the occasion for him to commit the occurrence, it is also submitted that it does not appear probable that the petitioner and his son would have intercepted him and fired at him.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that during the course of investigation, it has come that informant received fire arm injury on his left hand and the allegation in the FIR is against the petitioner of causing the fire arm injury.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned



A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

annpurna/-

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

