

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.49164 of 2018**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-101 Year-2017 Thana- SONO District- Jamui

Ram Kirtan Mandal @ Ram Kritan Mandal, Son of Late Churaman Mandal,  
Resident of Village- Lakhan Kiyari, P.S.- Sono, District- Jamui.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prakash Mahto, Adv.  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Yogendra Kumar, A.P.P.  
Mr. Bindeshwar Prasad Singh, Adv.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2     20-08-2018                      Heard Sri Prakash Mahto, learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri Yogendra Kumar, learned Addl. Public Prosecutor as well as Sri Bindeshwar Prasad Singh, learned counsel for the informant.

The sole petitioner, who is in custody since 08.04.2018 in Sono P.S. Case No.101 of 2017 registered for the offence under Sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 307, 325,302 of the Indian Penal Code, has prayed for grant of bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that of course, in the F.I.R. there is specific accusation that the petitioner had given sword blow on the informant, but during post-mortem examination and on examination of injuries of other injured, no sharp-cut injury was found and, as such, the



petitioner has falsely been made accused. It has also been argued that at least three accused persons, in the present case, have already been granted bail by a Bench of this Court vide Cr.Misc.No. 34283 of 2017 on 26.07.2017.

Learned counsel for the informant has opposed the prayer for bail and submits that out of three accused persons, who were granted bail, two were ladies and one another accused person was handicaped and, as such, the case of those accused persons may not be considered at par with the case of the petitioner. He further submits that the prayer for bail of other accused person has already been rejected vide Cr.Misc.No.37887 of 2018.

Besides hearing, I have also perused the material on record , particularly the F.I.R. and after going through the same, it is evident that in the F.I.R. there is specific accusation against the petitioner and, as such, I do not find any ground to extend the privilege of bail to the petitioner.

The petition stands dismissed.

**(Rakesh Kumar, J.)**

nawalkrs/-

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

