

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80715 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-108 Year-2018 Thana- DINARA District- Rohtas

-
1. Ranjeet Kumar @ Bhulan son of Ramjee Singh village- Dehra, Ps- Bikramganj, Dist- Rohtas
 2. Golu Kumar @ Abhishek Kumar @ Gullu Kumar Son of Rajdeo Singh village- Dhawai, Ps- Dawath, Dist- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Malti Kumari, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Harendra Prasad, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 09-12-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Dinara P.S. Case No. 108 of 2018 registered for the offences punishable under Section 394 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Allegedly, two miscreants are said to have snatched Rs. 20,000/- which was withdrawn from the bank by the informant.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that the 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. No any incriminating article has been recovered from the physical conscious possession of the petitioners or from their house. They are not named in the FIR. Their names have been transpired in the present case due to previous enmity and dirty village politics. It is further submitted that the alleged occurrence took place on 23.04.2018, but the police have implicated and remanded the petitioners on 05.06.2024 after about 6 years of the said occurrence. Learned counsel further submits that there is no evidence against the petitioners either direct or indirect. Petitioner no.1 has three criminal antecedents, whereas petitioner no.2 has two criminal antecedents as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

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

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

7. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

