

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-64 Year-2024 Thana- KUDHNI District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/S

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Manoj Singh
For the State	:	Mr. Nawal Kishore Prasad
For the Informant	:	Mr. Binod Kumar Sinha
		Mr. Ajay Kumar Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 19-09-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, the
learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in Kudhni P. S. Case No.64 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 324, 307 and 379/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, at the outset, submits that Bawan Kumar along with Nawneet Kumar and Suman Kumar had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.46571 of 2024 and the same was allowed by an order dated 18.07.2024. It is next submitted that Bawan Kumar and two others were granted



the privilege of anticipatory bail on the ground that specific allegation of assaulting the informant was against Rajnish. It is also submitted that informant suffered grievous injury on his head and near his eye. It is next submitted that the learned counsel, who is arguing the present anticipatory bail application had also argued the case of Bawan Kumar, Nawneet Kumar and Suman Kumar and had made a specific submission that it was Rajnish, who had assaulted the informant causing grievous injury.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner does not dispute the said submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant that he had argued the case of Bawan, Navneet and Suman, but then, name of Mr. Sanjay Kumar S.K. was recorded in the order. The learned counsel fairly submits that Rajnish is alleged to have assaulted by butt of pistol, but then, the case has not been instituted under the Arms Act, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that investigation is still continuing.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the informant and the fact that informant has suffered grievous injury, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



6. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail
stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

