

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74675 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-17 Year-2024 Thana- KALYANPUR District- Samastipur

Ranjan Thakur @ Ranjay Kumar @ Shankar Thakur S/O Surendra Thakur
Resident Of Village- Tara @ Madhopur, P.S- Musrigharari, Distt.- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anu Priyadarshni, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Murli Dhar, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 18-01-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with kalyanpur
P.S. Case No. 17 of 2024 instituted for the offences punishable under
Section 399, 400, 402, 120B of the Indian Penal code and Section
25(1-b)a, 26/35 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, F.I.R. has been lodged
against eight named accused persons including the present petitioner
against whom there is a recovery of illegal Ganja, Arms and live
cartridges and the apprehended accused persons disclosed the name
of this petitioner who succeeded in fleeing away from the spot.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits
that he has one criminal antecedent in which he is on bail. He next



submits that neither incriminating any incriminating material has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner nor he is connected with the alleged occurrence. He was not present at the place of occurrence and his name transpired only on the confessional statement of other co-accused person who was apprehended from the spot.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. From perusal of the F.I.R. and the impugned order dated 29.08.2024, it appears that petitioner's name has been figured in this case by the confessional statement of the petitioner who was apprehended from spot with arms. Moreover, petitioner has one criminal antecedent, so considering all aspects of the matter and the submissions made on behalf of the parties and the fact that petitioner possesses one criminal antecedent, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Sunnykr/-

U			
---	--	--	--

