

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49010 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-566 Year-2023 Thana- MITHANPURA District- Muzaffarpur

Md. Danish S/O Md Arif R/O Pankaj Market Saraiya Ganj, P.S- Town, Distt.-
Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Uday Prakash Sharma, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arvind Kumar Pandey, APP-84

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND
MALVIYA**

ORAL ORDER

5 17-01-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Allegation against the petitioner is to have committed the murder of the son of the informant along with other co-accused persons.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence and has falsely been implicated in this case due to dirty village politics. He next submits that similarly situated co-accused persons have already been granted regular bail by this Court passed in Cr.



Misc. Nos.50190 of 2024, 38299 of 2024, 39076 of 2024, 41093 of 2024 and 36269 of 2024. Petitioner has got one criminal antecedent as stated in para-3 of the petition.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that if the anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, then it may affect the investigation in this case, so the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner be rejected for proper investigation of the case.

6. From perusal of the FIR, case diary and impugned order dated 14.05.2024, it appears that the petitioner has got one criminal antecedent as stated in para-3 of the petition and specific allegation has been levelled against the petitioner and it also appears from para-5, 6 and 7 of the case diary, the witnesses have also supported the case of the prosecution and from the postmortem report of the deceased that the deceased died due to bullet injuries, considering all aspects of the matter, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Brajesh Kumar/-

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

