

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4789 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-415 Year-2023 Thana- MUZAFFARPUR TOWN District-
Muzaffarpur

=====

Suleman @ Md Suleman son of Md. Anwar R/o- Village- Chandwara, P.S.-
town District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR THE ADVOCATE GENERAL BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjit Kumar Thakur

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Brajendra Nath Pandey

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 21-02-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Town P.S. Case No. 415 of 2023 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 341, 323, 307, 504, 506 and 34 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, it is
next submitted that the date of occurrence is 17.05.2023 and the
FIR has been instituted on 26.05.2023 without explaining the
delay. It is also submitted that even presuming what has been
alleged is true without admitting then the injury suffered by the
injured is simple in nature.

4. The learned APP for the State vehemently opposes



the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and rebuts the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the petitioner along with named accused persons assaulted the informant who is a lady. It is next submitted that plausible explanation for instituting the FIR after some delay has also been furnished, as the informant in the FIR herself has stated that after the occurrence she was taken to Sadar hospital, Muzaffarpur where she was treated and after treatment she was referred to SKMCH, it is thus submitted that though doctor has opined the nature of injury to be simple but then it was on vital part of the body.

5. Considering the submission made by the learned APP for the State and the fact that the petitioner assaulted a woman, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

