

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No 25510 of 2020**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-521 Year-2018 Thana- BARAUNI District- Begusarai

=====

RANJEET KUMAR SINGH @ RANJIT KUMAR @ RANJEET SINGH Son
of Late Ramdev Singh @ Ramdev Singh Resident of Village- Keshave, P.S.-
Barauni, District- Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr Sandip Kumar Gautam, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr Umeshanand Pandit, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr Shubhesh Pandey, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

6 01-12-2020 As of now, the Courts have not resumed normal physical hearing. The matter has been listed today for consideration through Video Conferencing.

Learned counsels are appearing and making submissions from their residence. The Court Master and Secretary are also part of this virtual Court proceedings with the aid of audio visual technology.

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

The petitioner seeks bail in Barauni Police Station (for brevity, PS) Case No 521 of 2018 dated 06.11.2018 instituted for the offence punishable under Sections 307/34 of Indian



Penal Code and Section 27 of Arms Act.

Allegation in this case is based on a dispute due to rivalry between the partners in respect of a contract work. The petitioner has fired upon the chest of the informant from close range.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the injury report does not record any blackening or charring though there is an entry wound on the chest of the informant. Absence of any blackening and charring renders the prosecution case doubtful. It is further submitted that the son of the informant is said to be present though he has not intervened. It is also submitted that wife of the informant has not been able to disclose the time of occurrence.

The learned APP for the State and the learned counsel for the informant have opposed the prayer for bail. It is submitted that the absence of blackening and charring is obvious as the allegation is not of shooting from point blank range. Secondly, it is submitted that certain lapses, committed in the investigation, cannot enure to the benefit of the petitioner in view of the medical report fully corroborating the allegations in the first information report. Petitioner is accused of shooting upon the chest of the informant and, therefore, does not deserve



privilege of bail.

Considering the rival submissions and that the petitioner is in custody since 03.03.2020, this Court, for the present, is not inclined to allow the prayer for bail. The same is rejected.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

M.E.H./-

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

