

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69204 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-742 Year-2022 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE District-
Rohtas

-
1. Satrudhan Singh Son Of Late Bitan Kanhar @ Vitan Kahar Resident Of Village-, Surajpura ,PS- Surajpura, Dist- Rohtas
 2. Arjun Singh Son Of Late Nemdhari Kahar Resident Of Village-Surajpura, Ps- Surajpura, Dist- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Suresh Singh S/O Shambhu Singh R/O Village- Surajpura, Ps. Surajpura P.O. Surajpura, Dist. Rohtash At (sasaram)

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Suraj Deo Singh
For the State	:	Mr. Ram Anurag Singh
For the Complainant	:	Mr. Om Prakash Upadhyay

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 25-01-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State assisted by learned counsel for the complainant.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in Complaint Case No. 742 of 2022 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 417, 504 of the Indian Penal Code pending in the Court of learned S.D.J.M., Bikramganj, Rohtas at Sasaram.

3. As per the prosecution case, petitioners along with other co-accused persons, under conspiracy, are said to have sold land of complainant's share. Then the complainant



filed proceeding u/s 144 of Cr.P.C., and when the accused persons came to know regarding the proceeding u/s 144 of Cr.P.C. the accused persons came, abused and assaulted the informant and snatched gold chains.

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. He submits that it is a civil dispute between the parties. He further submits that petitioner and the complainant are agnates. The also submits that purchaser has been granted anticipatory bail. The petitioners have no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the complainant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that the petitioners have not produced any document regarding the ownership of land. Hence, they do not deserve privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected.



7. However, if the petitioners surrender before the learned Court below within six weeks from today and seek regular bail, the learned Court below would pass order on the same day in accordance with law without being prejudiced by this order.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

anand/-

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

