

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68024 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-86 Year-2024 Thana- Dehri Mufassil District- Rohtas

Shakil Ansari Son of Kurban Ansari R/o Village- Deoriya, P.S.- Dehri (Mu.),
District- Rohtas at Sasaram

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dharmendra Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

3 18-12-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf
of the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Dehri Muffasil P.S. Case No.86/2024, registered for the
offence punishable under Sections 341, 323, 143, 504, 506, 379
and 307 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is alleged to
have assaulted the injured with an iron rod causing injury on
head. It is next submitted that the F.I.R. has been instituted after
a delay of two days and when the F.I.R. was instituted, at that
time, Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code was not added but
subsequently after one month, during the course of
investigation, Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code has been
added. It is also submitted that on account of trivial dispute, the



occurrence is alleged to have taken place, as it is alleged that IPL match was going on, which was being screened and the petitioner and other accused were collecting money for allowing others to witness the match, on which, a dispute arose, when the occurrence is alleged to have taken place.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that there is specific allegation against this petitioner of assaulting the injured by an iron rod causing injury on head, which is vital part of the body and the injury is grievous in nature, which amply demonstrates that the force used by the petitioner for committing the occurrence was much.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

