

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.66561 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-368 Year-2023 Thana- BHANGWANPUR HAT District- Siwan

Rajeev Ranjan @ Rajeev Kumar Singh S/O Sri Anil Singh Resident of
village- Sondhani, P.S.- Bhagwanpur, District- Siwan

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Mili Kumari

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 03-10-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State, Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Bhagwanpur (Hat) P.S. Case No. 368 of 2023 registered for
the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 324, 307, 504
and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case was mentioned yesterday on grounds of
urgency and also on the ground that the injury suffered by the
injured is simple in nature.

4. Today, when the case is taken up, the learned
counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that
though the opinion with respect to the injury has not been
opined and is reserved, but then from perusal of the injury
report, it would manifest that the nature of injury suffered by the
injured appears to be simple. It is also submitted that the Court
is experts of all experts, as such, the Court on perusal of the



injury report, can come to a conclusion whether the injury suffered by the injured is simple or grievous in nature.

5. The learned APP for the State, Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that the anticipatory bail application be rejected solely on the ground that the case has been taken out of turn on a false mentioning that the injury suffered by the injured is simple in nature when the injury report does not record that the injury is simple. It is also submitted that no doubt Court is expert of experts, but then the Court cannot be relegated to the position of a competent doctor who still has to give his opinion.

6. The Court based on the opinion could have formed its own opinion.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to entertain the anticipatory bail application.

8. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

