

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49483 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-975 Year-2022 Thana- SIKARPUR District- West Champaran

MERAJUDDIN @ MERAJ S/O TAQUEERUDDIN R/O VILLAGE- WARD  
NO. 09, BARWA BARAULI, MANGHIRAHARI, PS. SHIKARPUR, DIST.  
WEST CHAMPARAN

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                            |                                                                        |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s :     | Mr.Abu Nasar, Adv.                                                     |
| For the Opposite Party/s : | Mr.Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP.<br>Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Shrivastava, Adv. |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      12-01-2024      Heard learned counsels for the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Shikarpur P.S. Case No. 975 of 2022 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 307, 120(B), 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of Arms Act.

3. Allegedly, petitioner along with other accused persons are said to have committed murder of the son of the informant.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. No such occurrence as alleged ever took place. He has been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is



totally false and based on concocted facts. He was not present at the place of occurrence. He is not named in the FIR. But, later on, during investigation, his name has been transpired in the present case as several witnesses have taken his name and stated that petitioner was driving the alleged motorcycle on which the main accused Md. Firdaus Akhtar was sitting and fired gun shot upon the informant's son. There is no specific overt act against the petitioner. He has one criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant opposes the prayer for bail. Learned counsel for the informant further submits that there is serious allegation against the petitioner to be involved in murder of the informant's son and several witnesses have also supported the prosecution case. Hence, he does not deserve the privilege of the anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of case as well as nature of the offence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

7. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the



learned Court below within six weeks from today and seeks regular bail, the learned Court below shall pass order on the same day in accordance with law without being prejudiced by this order.

**(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)**

divyanshi/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

