

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.73120 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-268 Year-2021 Thana- WAJIRGANJ District- Gaya

1. DULARCHAND RAJVANSI SON OF JITAN RAJVANSI R/O VILLAGE- CHAIN BIGHA, P.S.- WAZIRGANJ, DIST.- GAYA
2. RAVINDRA RAVANSI @ RAVINDER KUMAR @ RAVINDRA RAJVANSI @ RAVENDRA RAJVANSI SON OF GANAURI RAJVANSI R/O VILLAGE- CHAIN BIGHA, P.S.- WAZIRGANJ, DIST.- GAYA
3. KARAN RAVANSI @ KARAN RAJVANSI SON OF SURESH RAJVANSI R/O VILLAGE- CHAIN BIGHA, P.S.- WAZIRGANJ, DIST.- GAYA
4. LALLU RAJVANSI @ LALU RAJVANSI SON OF JAIRAM RAJVANSI R/O VILLAGE- CHAIN BIGHA, P.S.- WAZIRGANJ, DIST.- GAYA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Aryan Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shailendra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

3 29-02-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Wajirganj P.S. Case No. 268 of 2021, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 504, 308, 427, 379 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and later Section 302 of the IPC was added.

3. As per allegation, thirteen named accused persons including the petitioners entered into the house of the informant and they started assaulting her. When her husband came to rescue her, the



accused persons assaulted him with *lathi, danda and khanti*. They also dismantled the house. Due to assault, her husband was hospitalized and he died during course of treatment.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the statement of the deceased has not been recorded despite he was admitted for ten days in the hospital. He has submitted further that the informant has falsely implicated all the family members of the defense side.

5. On the other hand, Sri Shailendra Kumar, the learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that multiple injuries on the dead body are enough to show that a number of persons have assaulted the deceased. The petitioners are named in the FIR. He has submitted further that multiple injuries on the person of the deceased establishes itself that he was not in a position to state and the statement of the victim, thus, could not be recorded.

6. Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, the petitioners do not deserve the privilege for anticipatory bail, which is hereby rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Kundan/-

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

