

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-136 Year-2024 Thana- KARAHGAR District- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Baxi S.R.P. Sinha, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Babu Nandan Prasad, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mithlesh Kumar Khare, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 19-08-2024 1. Heard learned Senior counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 304, 287 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that he works as a worker in the rice mill of the petitioner, further on 30.04.2024, an iron structure fell, on account of which, his brother (Satyam) and co-worker (Prince) died, next alleges that petitioner being the owner of the rice mill was informed by the informant and other worker on 28.04.2024 about the weakness of the iron structure which required



wielding on which the petitioner had assured that the iron structure would be repaired but then the same was not done leading to the accident in which two persons lost their lives.

4. The learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation, it would manifest that the death was accidental. It is next submitted that no doubt the workers who died worked in the rice mill of the petitioner and even the petitioner was informed about the weakness of the iron structure on 28.04.2024 by the workers of his rice mill but then the accident took place on 30.04.2024 i.e. within two days of the information given by the workers of the mill about the condition of the iron structure. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. it would manifest that the informant does not allege that the petitioner did not agree to repair the iron structure rather had agreed but on account of paucity of time, the same could not be done leading to the accident.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the



event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Kargahar P.S. Case No.136/2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

