

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.81372 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-46 Year-2024 Thana- BAJPATTI District- Sitamarhi

1. Prabhat Kumar Son of Umashankar Rai @ Uma Shankar Prasad Yadav R/O village - Sandwara ward no. 1, P.S. - Bajpatti, Dist. - Sitamarhi.
2. Rajababu @ Aryan Raj Son of Umashankar Rai @ Uma Shankar Prasad Yadav R/O village - Sandwara ward no. 1, P.S. - Bajpatti, Dist. - Sitamarhi.
3. Phulbabu @ Fulbabu Yaadv Son of Umashankar Rai @ Uma Shankar Prasad Yadav R/O village - Sandwara ward no. 1, P.S. - Bajpatti, Dist. - Sitamarhi.
4. Chandbabu @ Chand Babu Yadav Son of Umashankar Rai @ Uma Shankar Prasad Yadav R/O village - Sandwara ward no. 1, P.S. - Bajpatti, Dist. - Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Virendra Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anil Prasad Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 11-12-2024 1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioners and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.
2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail, arises out of Bajpatti Police Station Case No. 46 of 2024, dated 16.02.2024, disclosing offences punishable under Sections 147/148/149/341/323/379/504/506 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 25(1-b)a/26/27 of the Arms Act.
3. The prosecution case, as per the First Information Report, is that in the night of 15.02.2024, while the informant was walking after taking dinner, the petitioners, along with other co-accused persons surrounded him and the



petitioner no. 1 caught hold his waist, petitioner no. 3 started assaulting him and petitioner no. 4 resorted to firing in the air and put the pistol on the temple of the informant and threatened to kill him. The petitioner no. 2 snatched golden chain from the neck of the informant.

- 4. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have falsely been implicated in this case due to long standing land dispute and previous enmity. He further submits that no injury has been caused to the informant and both the parties are co-villagers.
- 5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that the petitioners have chequered history.
- 6. Regards being had to the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioners have criminal antecedent, I am not inclined to grant the petitioners privilege of anticipatory bail.
- 7. This application is, accordingly, dismissed

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	√	T	√
---	---	---	---

