

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67508 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-269 Year-2020 Thana- ARA MUFFSIL District- Bhojpur

=====

Dinesh Ranjan @ Dinesh Ranjan Ram Son Of Late Dawarika Prasad Resident
Of Mohalla- Jagwaliya, Ps- Ara Mofassil, Distt- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. S.D. Sanjay, Sr. Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nand Kishore Prasad

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 23-01-2024 Heard Mr. S.D. Sanjay, learned senior counsel for the

petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing

on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in connection
with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 269 of 2020, registered for the
offence punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 324, 302,
504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per F.I.R., allegation against the petitioner is that
he along with other co-accused person assaulted the son of
informant by weapon and due to assault son of the informant
died.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case.
Petitioner has got no criminal antecedent. He further submits
that charge-sheet has been submitted against four co-accused
persons and trial was going on (Session Tr. No. 26 of 2022) and
the statement of the some witnesses including the informant



does not support the prosecution case. He further submits that by detailed order dated 01.11.2023, a coordinate Bench of this Court called for a report with regard to the fact that processes of under Sections 82 Cr.P.C. and under Section 83 Cr.P.C. was issued against the petitioner or not and it is admitted fact that no bail petition was pending before this Court.

5. Learned APP has opposed the prayer for bail and submits that the petitioner is main assailant and Process under Section 82 and 83 Cr.P.C. has already been issued, the petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid submission of the parties and after perusing the report at Flag-R, Sections 82 and 83 Cr.P.C. has already been issued on 01.09.2021 and 02.02.2022 against the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant him anticipatory bail.

7. Hence, his prayer for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Ranjeet/-

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

