

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19254 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-172 Year-2024 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

Shiv Chandra Singh @ Guddu Singh Son of Late Kailash Singh R/V
-ATHARI PS- RUNNISAIDPUR DIST -SITAMARHI

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pushpendra Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 23-04-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323,
387, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 27
of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of six cases and the informant alleges
that Sachin along with an unknown accused came and forcibly
took the informant to the house of the petitioner, where
petitioner threatened with a gun and also fired, further made the
informant sign some blank papers and even threatened to
transfer his land in the name of the petitioner or to pay extortion
of Rs. 20,000/- per month.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that the date of occurrence is 23.05.2024 and the FIR has been instituted after delay of three days i.e. on 26.05.2024 without any plausible explanation of delay, which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution. It is also submitted that there is a dispute in between the petitioner and the informant with regard to a piece of land, as such, the informant falsely implicated the petitioner in the instant case in order to coerce him into submission so that he does not lay claim over the land in dispute.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. It is next submitted that from perusal of Para-3 to the anticipatory bail application, it would manifest that petitioner has antecedent of six serious cases. It is also submitted that there is specific allegation against the petitioner that he got the informant lifted from his house forcefully and brought to his house and thereafter he was made to sign some blank papers and was threatened to transfer the land. It is also submitted that no doubt there is a delay of three days in instituting the FIR, but then one has to muster courage to



institute an FIR against a person who carries serious criminal antecedents.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

