

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.46327 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-40 Year-2019 Thana- BIKRAMGANJ District- Rohtas

=====

Dhirendra Kumar Ranjan @ Sujit Kumar, son of Sri Anil Kumar, resident of village- Tenduni, Mohalla- Dhibara, Ward No. 4, P.S.- Bikramganj, District- Rohtas (Sasaram).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Manish Kumar No. 13, Advocate
		Mr. Rohit Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Md. Arif, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 11-12-2019

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Bikramganj PS Case No.40 of 2019 dated 20.01.2019 instituted
under Sections 302, 307, 326, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The allegation against the petitioner, though not
named, is of being involved in the murder of one daughter of the
informant and murderous attack on the other.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that he
has been unnecessarily made an accused without there being
any evidence against him. It was submitted that against co-
accused Shambhu Pandey, there is sufficient material, but
against the petitioner, it is only the confessional statement of
Shambhu Pandey. It was submitted that no witness has seen the



petitioner. It was submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 16.02.2019.

5. Learned APP, from the case diary, submitted that in the confessional statement Shambhu Pandey has given details with regard to the role of the petitioner and it is he, who took Shambhu Pandey from the scene of the crime on a motorcycle. It was further submitted that the second daughter of the informant, who was badly injured, has identified Shambhu Pandey and further that Shambhu Pandey having narrated the sequence of events, in detail, clearly shows that the petitioner was an equal partner to the crime. It was submitted that the petitioner could not have been seen as it was only Shambhu Pandey, who was at the place of occurrence as the petitioner had gone away from there earlier and further that he was instrumental in getting the razor and other materials, which was used by Shambhu Pandey for committing the crime.

6. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J)

J. Alam/-

AFR/NAFR	
U	
T	

