

In the Court of Additional Sessions Judge-I, Darbhanga**Anticipatory Bail Petition 1654/2024**

Abhinandan Kumar Yadav

----- Petitioner

versus

State of Bihar

----- Opposite Party

Appearance(s):

Counsel for the Petitioner(s) : S. L. Yadav, Adv.

Counsel for the State : N Haider, Adv

Present:- Suman Kumar Divakar
Bihar Superior Judicial Service

ORDER**11.02.2025**

1. The petitioner is praying for anticipatory bail in connection with Moro P.S. Case No. 31/2024 registered for the offences under Section 341, 323, 392 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter referred to as 'IPC' for short).
2. Briefly stated, the informant has alleged that on 29.05.2024, he along with his wife was going to his sasural. At about 07:50 he reached at Ram Swaroop Chowk. Then, three motorcycle borne miscreants apprehended them from the front and put them under fear of weapon. They assaulted him and his wife. Thereafter, they snatched ornaments from his wife which costs may be to the extent of Rs. 50,000-60,000/-. They also snatched the mobile of the informant. The name of the petitioner has surfaced on the confessional statement of the co-accused Mahesh Yadav.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an innocent. He has no complicity with the present case. Vide para-3 of the petition it has been stated that the petitioner carries one criminal antecedent. Nothing has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. No case is made out against the petitioner.
4. Learned Public Prosecutor has opposed the prayer so made on behalf of the petitioner.
5. Heard the Parties. Considered the submission. Perused the material on record including the case diary. It appears from para- 77 of the case diary that the petitioner is also accused in Bishanpur P.S. Case No. 61/2024 registered for the offence under Section 392 of the IPC and Bahadurpur

P.S. Case No. 216/2023 registered for the offence under Section 302/307/34 of the IPC. It appears from the record that regular bail petition of the co-accused has been dismissed.

6. In view of above, considering the nature and gravity of the offence coupled with the criminal antecedent of the similar in nature and the fact that the prayer for regular bail of co-accused has been dismissed, I am not inclined to extend him the privilege of pre-arrest bail. As a result, the present petition stands **dismissed**.

Additional Sessions Judge-I
Darbhanga.

WEB COPY