

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.84814 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-284 Year-2023 Thana- RAFIGANJ District- Aurangabad

Saurabh Singh @ Saurabh Kumar Son of Rakesh Singh @ Bullu Singh
Resident of - Khandwa, Kona, P.S- Rafiganj, District - Aurangabad (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Aman Vishal, Adv. Ms. Lilawati Kumari, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Anil Prasad Singh, APP. Mr. Priya Ranjan, Adv. Mr. Mukesh Kumar, Adv. Ms. Chandani Kumari, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 15-01-2024 Heard learned counsels for the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Rafiganj P.S.

Case No. 284 of 2023 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 504, 506, 379, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and later on, Section 302 has been added.

3. Allegedly, all the accused persons including the petitioner are said to have assaulted the informant's father and snatched a gold chain worth Rs.20,000/- and a mobile from his possession. They also took his signature on two blank stamp papers. It is further alleged that the victim died during the course of medical treatment.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. No such occurrence as alleged ever took place. He has been falsely



implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. The deceased had enmity with one Sarita Devi who has lodged a complaint case against the deceased Surendra Prasad vide complaint case no. 563 of 2023 and due to above enmity, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. The real fact is that the deceased was assaulted by the extremist due to which he died during the course of his treatment. It is further submitted that the process under Section 82 has been issued against the petitioner. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail.

6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, as the process under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. has already been issued against the petitioner, I am not inclined to enlarge him on anticipatory bail.

7. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

