

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78210 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-96 Year-2024 Thana- Dehri Mufassil District- Rohtas

-
1. Ujjwal Yadav S/o Guput Yadav @ Gupteshwar Yadav R/o Village-Jamuhar, P.S.-Dehri Muffasil, District- Rohtas
 2. Prince Yadav @ Parmanand Yadav @ Prince Kumar @ Parmanand Kumar S/o Arun Yadav R/o Village-Jamuhar, P.S.-Dehri Muffasil, District- Rohtas
- Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar No.1, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 21-11-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Dehri (Muffasil) P.S. Case No. 96 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 143, 323, 341, 504, 506 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Allegedly, all the FIR named accused persons including the petitioners along with 15 unknown miscreants are said to have opened fire upon the informant's house indiscriminately.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioners are quite innocent and have committed no offence. No such occurrence as alleged has ever taken place. They have falsely been implicated in this case due to ulterior



motive. The allegation levelled against the petitioners is totally false and based on concocted facts. None of the independent witnesses have supported the prosecution case. Though there is serious allegation of indiscriminate firing, but nobody has sustained fire arm injury in the alleged occurrence. No recovery of any used fire arm cartridge has been made from the place of occurrence. Learned counsel further submits that there is case and counter case between the parties. Petitioner no.1 has one criminal antecedent of similar nature of offence, whereas petitioner no.2 has three criminal antecedents out of which two are of similar nature of offence that of the present case.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case particularly the criminal antecedent of the petitioners having similar nature of offence that of the present case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail. The prayer for bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected.

7. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

