

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.391 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-258 Year-2024 Thana- MUNGER MUFFASIL District- Munger

-
1. Sanju Devi @ Ranju Devi W/o Dablu Poddar R/o - South Shastri Nagar, P.S - Kasim Bazar, District - Munger
 2. Abhay Kumar @ Ajay Poddar S/o Dablu Poddar R/o - South Shastri Nagar, P.S - Kasim Bazar, District - Munger

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjiv Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Abhay Kumar Roy

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 05-02-2025 1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioners and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail,
arises out of Muffasil Police Station Case No. 258 of 2024,
disclosing offences under Sections 103, 61(2), 3(5) of the BNS,
2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, informant was waiting
at Teen Batia Chowk after returning from Chadi Sthan. The
informant had to go to Khagaria. On 13.07.2024, at around 10
am, the informant's son Manjit Mandal was going in a Brezza
car with his driver Chandan Mandal, when the informant's son



stopped the car near Sangeeta Hotel at Teen Batia came out to buy Rajnigandha. The informant's son called the shopkeeper and gave him the money, as soon as the shopkeeper turned, Pawan Mandal, Prince Singh, Shyam Poddar took out pistols from their waist and fired at the informant's son and his driver, due to which both died on the spot. Ajay Poddar, Ranju Devi and Rahul Kumar were doing lining work. The house of Ajay Poddar and Ranju Devi is near the informant's house.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have falsely been implicated in the present case due to ulterior motive of the informant. From perusal of the FIR, it would be evident that petitioners and informant are neighbor in South Shastri Nagar, Munger, and the distance between Shastri Nagar and P.O. is around 5 kms then how informant has alleged that both the petitioners have participated in this occurrence as liner if both were not present at P.O. There was previous dispute between the parties. During the course of investigation, informant, in her restatement, before the I.O., has stated that there was a property related dispute between one Pawan Mandal and the deceased son of the informant and due to this, little altercation took place between Pawan Mandal and her deceased son. The Dy.S.P., Munger, till 06.10.2024, has not



found any single material against the petitioners. He next submits that due to non-fulfillment of illegal demand by the informant, the petitioners have been made accused.

5. Having regard to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the gravity of offence and the fact that petitioners are named in the FIR, the petitioners have been accused of acting as liners in the incident, and all the witnesses have supported the incident, I am not inclined to grant the petitioners privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. This application is, accordingly, rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

HarshPandey/-

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

