

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78025 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-358 Year-2024 Thana- DIGHA District- Patna

=====

Ankit Kumar, Son of Raju Verma @ Raju Kumar Verma @ Raj Kumar Verma, Resident of Jandaha Chand Sarai, P.S.- Mahosoor, Dist.- Vaishali, Presently, Resident at Veer Kuwar Singh Colony, North of Tirhut Academy, Ward No. 5, P.S.- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bhola Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Jagdhhar Prasad, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 21-02-2025 Heard Mr. Bhola Prasad, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.Jagdhhar Prasad, learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Digha P.S. Case No. 358 of 2024 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 120(B), 302 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the son of the informant Rahul Kumar was doing business of medicine and was living with his father. Ankit Kumar was his staff. On 10.06.2024, Ankit Kumar called his son at his flat. Later on, his son was killed there.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further



submitted that petitioner is only the staff of the informant and he has got no role in the occurrence. A statement has been made in para 3 of the petition that petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP appearing for the state has opposed the prayer of anticipatory bail and submitted that from perusal of the F.I.R., it is clear that petitioner is the person who has called the deceased on his flat where he was being killed. It is further submitted that the prayer of regular bail of other two co-accused persons has already been rejected by this Court vide order dated 23.01.2025 in Cr. Misc. No. 76936 of 2024 and 76889 of 2024.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also argued that there are two independent witnesses who have stated that during videography, the deceased has fallen from the roof but from perusal of the F.I.R., it is clear that the deceased has gone with his cousin Kundan Kumar Thakur and the version of Kundan Kumar is otherwise.

7. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of allegation, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage and, as such, his prayer for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

lata/-

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

