

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.30671 of 2015**

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -24 Year- 2014 Thana -SAHPUR District- BHOJPUR

Chitranjan Pandey Son of Uma Shankar Pandey Resident of village -  
Shahpur, P.S. Shahpur, District - Bhojpur at Ara ( Bihar )

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... .... Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Sr. Adv  
Mr. A.K. Pandey, Adv.  
Mr. M.K. Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Om Prakash Upadhyay, Adv.  
For the Opposite Party No. 2 : Mr. V.K. Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Akhileshwar Singh, Adv.  
For the State : Mr. M. Jha (A.P.P.)

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN SHARMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

8 02-02-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
A.P.P. representing the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Shahpur  
P.S. Case No. 24 of 2014 registered for the offences punishable  
under Sections 302, 120(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegedly, Krishna Pandey injured of earlier  
occurrence got admitted the deceased which caused annoyance to  
Ashutosh Pandey @ Krishna Pandey who gave threats to kill him  
from jail itself and again the petitioner and another co-accused  
namely, Pankaj Rai, Nikki Singh @ Mithilesh Singh, Ravindra  
Singh @ Lala threatened to kill the son of the informant within  
eight to ten days and thereafter on 20.01.2014 at about 6 p.m. the  
petitioner and co-accused namely, Pankaj Rai, Ravindra Singh @  
Lala, Nikki Singh @ Mithilesh Singh shot Sudhir Kumar @  
Suman Kumar, the son of the informant dead which was seen by

nephew Chhotu Kumar and another son Baru Kumar of the informant.

Submission is of false implication and that against the petitioner there is no specific allegation, during investigation it has come that Nikki Singh and the petitioner were seen fleeing away with fire arm and on the person of deceased only one injury has been found caused by fire arm. Further the case has not been committed as yet and is pending and petitioner is suffering in custody since 11.07.2014.

The learned A.P.P. duly assisted by the learned counsel for the informant opposes the prayer of bail by submitting that the petitioner and co-accused shot the son of the informant causing his death by opening indiscriminate firing.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, considering the allegation attributed against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and accordingly, such prayer stands rejected.

However, the learned Magistrate is directed to expedite the commitment of the case at once and thereafter the trial court shall take all the positive steps to conclude the trial as early as possible.

**(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)**

sushma/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

