

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13490 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-717 Year-2024 Thana- JAMUI District- Jamui

=====

Anshu Rawat @ Chiku Rawat @ Chiku Son of Raju Rawat Resident of
Mohalla- Kalyanpur, P.S. and Distt.- Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Satya Prakash Parasar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Satya Nand Shukla, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 28-03-2025 Heard Mr.Satya Prakash Parasar learned counsel for

the petitioner and Mr.Satya Nand Shukla, learned Additional

Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Jamui P.S.Case No.717 of 2024,FIR dated
06.11.2024 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 126(2), 115(2),109,303(2),325(4),351(2)(3) and 3(5) of
Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case as stated in the F.I.R.is that on
5.11.2024 when the informant has went to City Cart Mall
alongwith his two younger brothers for purchase of cloths. It is
alleged that after purchase when he was standing in the queue
near billing counter, suddenly the accused/petitioner Ansu
Rawat has arrived there and he after breaking the queue started



insisting the staff of the Mall to prepare his own bill, to which, the informant has objected and said that he is already in queue, so he cannot do this. It is alleged that the accused/petitioner called the some of his group members in the Mall, and upon arrival of other accused persons as named in the F.I.R. they caught hold of the informant and drag him out of the Mall. They brought the informant near Petrol Pump and brutally assaulted him. They further tried to abduct the informant by making him to sit in a Toto. However, due to intervention of some on lookers, the accused persons could not took him alongwith them. However, while leaving the PO. the accused persons particularly the co-accused Raju Rawat has snatched a sum of Rs.4500-from his pocket. They further broken the spectacles of the informant and snatched his pendant. According to the informant, the entire incident of marpit and snatching has been recorded in the CCTV camera installed in front of the Mall. The informant has further produced one Pen-drive along with the present written application for taking appropriate action against the accused persons.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. Although the petitioner is named



in the FIR but from a bare perusal of the FIR it appears that there is no specific allegation of any assault or overt-act attributed against the petitioner rather there is general and omnibus allegation against all the accused persons including the petitioner and it appears that the informant has received the injury but the injury report of the informant suggests that the injury is simple in nature.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts, petitioner has clean antecedent, there is no specific allegation of any assault or overt-act attributed against the petitioner and injury inflicted upon the informant/ injured person is simple in nature, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000 (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jamui in connection with Jamui P.S.Case No.717 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/ Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 and with other following conditions:-



(I) Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court and shall remain physically present as directed by the Court and on his/her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his/her bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

(II) If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(III) And, further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his/her criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

