

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.5712 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -202 Year- 2015 Thana -BAKHRI District- BEGUSARAI

- =====
1. Manoj Chaudhary Son of Late Bannu Chaudhary resident of village- Karaitar, P.S.- Bakhari, District- Begusarai
 2. Parshuram Chaudhary, son of Rajpati Chaudhary, resident of Rajopur, P.S. Dandari, District- Begusarai

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioners : Mr. Vijay Kumar, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party : Mr. Sanjay Kr.Panday(APP)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN SHARMA
ORAL ORDER

5 05-04-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P. representing the State.

The petitioners seek bail in connection with Bakhari (Begusarai) P.S. Case No. 202 of 2015 (G.R. No.3762 of 2015) registered for the offences punishable under Sections 447, 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code and under Section 27 of the Arms Act. Later on, Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code has been added.

Allegedly, the petitioner Manoj Chaudhary gave order to kill the informant and his father and then co-accused Subodh Chaudhary shot the informant in his ribcage and thereafter Vijay Rajak and the petitioner Parshuram Chaudhary shot the father of the informant, resulting both became injured. Later on,

during treatment, the informant Ranbir Kumar died in P.M.C.H., Patna.

Submission is of false implication and that the informant in his further statement in para-1 has not stated the name of the petitioner Parshuram Chaudhary that he shot the father of the informant and other witnesses have also not named the petitioner Parshuram Chaudhary vide para-6 of the case diary and as such the petitioners deserve sympathetic consideration to which the learned A.P.P. seriously opposes by submitting that Badal Kumar Chaudhary, after the death of informant Ranbir Kumar has given his fardbeyan wherein he has stated that Manoj Chaudhary shot Parmanand Chaudhary.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, at present, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail and accordingly, their such prayer of bail stands rejected. However, let the trial be expedited and concluded within six months failing which the petitioners may be at liberty to renew their prayer for bail.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J.)

Amit/-

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