

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.73179 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-136 Year-2024 Thana- LODIPUR District- Bhagalpur

Raj Kumar Ranjan Son of Sukhdev Prasad @ Sukhdev Prasad Singh @
Shukdev Prasad Singh R/O Mohalla- Railway Colony, Sikandarpur, P.S.-
Mohahidpur, Dist.- Bhagalpur. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sourendra Pandey, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Anant Kumar-1, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Saurav Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 26-10-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for
the State assisted by learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Lodipur P.S. Case No.
136 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 329(1), 352, 111, 351 (2), 3 (5) of the Bharatiya Nyay
Sahinta, 2023.

3. The allegation against the petitioner is that he is a habitual
offender of criminal breach of trust, forgery and organized
crime. This case is also in continuation of his habituated
offence.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that no
such occurrence as alleged ever took place. He has been falsely
implicated in this case. It is further submitted that from mere
perusal of the F.I.R., it is clear that the occurrence took place
on 01.08.2024, while the F.I.R. was lodged as an afterthought



on 10.08.2024, on a concocted story and without any explanation by the informant for the delay in lodging the F.I.R., despite the fact that the informant was a resident of that area, which creates serious doubt about the prosecution case. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. Petitioner has three criminal antecedents.

5. Learned APP for the State assisted by learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposing the bail petition submitted that the petitioner is in habit of committing such type of offences which is clear from his criminal antecedents. Hence, he does not deserve anticipatory bail.

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

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

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Trivedi/-

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

