



petitioner and submits that the petitioner is a history sifter as he is also involved in two other cases of similar nature. It is next submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required during the investigation of the case for recovery of the seven numbers of logs of wood which have been taken by him. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be given the privileges of anticipatory bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner as well as the requirement of his custodial interrogation for recovery of the looted articles by him and his criminal antecedent, this Court is of the considered view that it is not a fit case where the privileges of anticipatory bail be given to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the above named petitioner is rejected.

**(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)**