

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.62387 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-21 Year-2024 Thana- RATANPUR District- Supaul

- 1. PRAMOD MEHTA Son of Sukhdeo Mehta RESIDENT OF VILLAGE - LALMANPATTI, POLICE STATION - RATANPURA, DISTRICT- SUPAUL
- 2. RAJESH MEHTA @ RAJESH KUMAR MEHTA SON OF SUKHDEO MEHTA RESIDENT OF VILLAGE - LALMANPATTI, POLICE STATION - RATANPURA, DISTRICT- SUPAUL
- 3. SUKHDEO MEHTA SON OF LATE KHUSHI LAL MEHTA RESIDENT OF VILLAGE - LALMANPATTI, POLICE STATION - RATANPURA, DISTRICT- SUPAUL
- 4. MANJU DEVI WIFE OF PRAMOD MEHTA RESIDENT OF VILLAGE - LALMANPATTI, POLICE STATION - RATANPURA, DISTRICT- SUPAUL
- 5. SHANTI DEVI @ SHANTI KUMARI WIFE OF RAJESH MEHTA @ RAJESH KUMAR MEHTA RESIDENT OF VILLAGE - LALMANPATTI, POLICE STATION - RATANPURA, DISTRICT- SUPAUL

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mohammed Arif, APP.
Mr. Arun Kumar Jha, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 05-10-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned APP
for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection
with Ratanpura P.S. Case No. 21 of 2024 registered for the
offences punishable u/s 341, 323, 324, 325, 307, 354(b), 379,
504, 506, 34 of the IPC.

3. Allegedly, all the FIR named accused persons



including the petitioners are said to have abused and assaulted the informant's side brutally by means of deadly weapons due to which they sustained injuries. Petitioner no.1 assaulted one Bindeshwar Mehta by means of *Kulhari* on his head. He also tried to outrage the modesty of one Baby Devi.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners are quite innocent and have committed no offence. No such occurrence as alleged has ever taken place. They have falsely been implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. The allegation levelled against the petitioners is totally false and based on concocted facts. There is admitted land dispute between the parties for which Title Suit No. 80/2019 is pending before the learned Court below. Learned counsel further submits that the injury report of the injured does not support the prosecution case. Petitioner nos. 1, 2, 3 & 4 have one criminal antecedent, whereas petitioner no. 5 has no 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 submits that there is serious allegation against the petitioners to assault the informant's side brutally due to which some of the injured have sustained grievous injuries.



Hence, the petitioners do not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, as from bare perusal of the FIR, it is evident that there is general and omnibus allegation against petitioner nos. 2 to 5, let the above named petitioner nos. 2 to 5, be released on bail, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned lower Court where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Ratanpura P.S. Case No. 21 of 2024, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

7. However, considering the gravity of the offence, I am not inclined to enlarge petitioner no.1 on anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail of petitioner no.1 is hereby rejected.

8. Accordingly, this application stands partly allowed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

