

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.1247 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -916 Year- 2015 Thana -SITAMARHI District- SITAMARHI

=====

Ranjeet Kumar Singh @ Saurav Kumar Singh @ Saurav Singh son of Brij
Mohan Singh, resident of village – Sonaul Sultan, P.S. Purnahiya, District
Sheohar

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shankar Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dr.Mrityunjaya Kr.Gautam, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. NILU AGRAWAL
ORAL ORDER

2 16-01-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned A.P.P. for the State.

Petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since
17.10.2016 in connection with Sitamarhi P.S. Case No. 916 of
2015, G.R. No. 4049 of 2015 registered for the offence punishable
under Sections 302, 201 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The prosecution case is that son of the informant,
namely, Chandan Kumar had gone for his personal work but did
not return back. The next day, informant was informed on mobile
that his son has been murdered and his dead body was lying in
Sadar Hospital, Sitamarhi and motorcycle was thrown on the road.

It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the
petitioner that he is innocent, not named in the First Information
Report and there is no specific allegation against him, as First



Information Report has been lodged against unknown. He submits that it is only on the basis of suspicion and statement of one Mritunjay Kumar Singh, who was last seen with the deceased Chandan Kumar that the petitioner has been made accused. He submits that another co-accused, who has been named by the witnesses, has since been granted the privilege of bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 13648 of 2016 on 12.04.2016 and as named by the witnesses, another co-accused, who was last seen with the deceased, namely, Raushan Kumar @ Raushan Kumar Singh has also been granted the privilege of bail by this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 42058 of 2016 on 29.11.2016. He further submits that except suspicion, there is nothing against the petitioner's involvement in the present case.

However, learned A.P.P. for the State submits that the witnesses have supported the prosecution case that there was dispute with regard to money transaction between the two other co-accused and the deceased, hence, opposes the prayer for bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances since other co-accused have been granted the privilege of bail, let the petitioner, above named, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. ten thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief



Judicial Magistrate, Sitamarhi in connection with Sitamarhi P.S. Case No. 916 of 2015, G.R. No. 4049 of 2015, subject to the condition that petitioner shall not directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence and shall appear in the learned Court below, as and when required.

With these observations and directions, this application stands allowed.

(Nilu Agrawal, J.)

Arjun/-

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

