

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53801 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-981 Year-2023 Thana- GOPALGANJ COMPLAINT CASE
District- Gopalganj

-
1. Imran Siddique @ Munna @ Imran Ali Son Of S.K. Mahfooz Resident Of Village - Dhamapakar, P.S. - Manjhagarh, District - Gopalganj
 2. Imteyaz Ali Son Of S.K. Mahfooz Resident Of Village - Dhamapakar, P.S. - Manjhagarh, District - Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Qauley Azam S/O- Late Manzoor Alam R/O- village- Inderwan Bairun p.s- Gopalganj Dist-Gopalganj

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Irshad Ahmad Khan
For the State	:	Mr. Ram Sumiran Rai
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Javed Aslam

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

4 09-12-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the complainant.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in Complaint Case No. 981 of 2023 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 504, 506, 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioners have allegedly grabbed Rs.19,94,497/- from the complainant on account of opening poultry farm.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in



this case. The allegation levelled against the petitioners is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. The petitioners have no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. When the matter was heard earlier, learned counsel for the complainant objected that the petitioners have suppressed their criminal antecedent. Thereafter, a supplementary affidavit has been filed on behalf of the petitioners in which it is stated that the petitioners have one criminal antecedent.

6. Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the complainant opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the petitioners have tried to suppress their criminal antecedent and on this ground alone, they do not deserve privilege of anticipatory bail.

7. As petitioners have tried to suppress their criminal antecedent, I am not inclined to grant them privilege of anticipatory bail.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of petitioners is hereby rejected.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

anand/-

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

