

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
(FROM RESIDENTIAL OFFICE VIA VIDEO APPLICATION)
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3558 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-197 Year-2017 Thana- SANGRAMPUR District- East
Champaran

=====

SHASHI KANT TIWARY S/o Homila Tiwary R/o village- Sangrampur, P.S.-
Sangrampur, Distt.- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rajani Ranjan Pd. Singh, Advocate
For the Informant	;	Mr. Kundan Rathore, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Akhileshwar Dayal, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 13-04-2021 Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to

remove the defects as pointed out by the stamp reporter within

four weeks from the date of start of normal functioning of this

Court.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

A.P.P. for the State.

Petitioner in the present case is seeking regular bail

in connection with Sangrampur P.S. Case No. 197 of 2017

registered for the offences under Sections 341, 379, 307, 504,

506/120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the

petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He is gotia of



the informant and because of the land dispute, the present case has been lodged.

It is further submitted that earlier the family of the informant had lodged a case against the petitioner and his family members but in the said case the petitioner and others have been acquitted.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the informant submits that in the First Information Report, the specific allegation of firing on the vital part of the body causing grievous injury to the husband of the informant has been alleged against this petitioner. Attention of this Court has been drawn towards the order passed by the learned Sessions Judge, East Champaran, Motihari while rejecting the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

Learned A.P.P. for the State has also opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the seriousness of the allegation wherein this petitioner has allegedly fired upon the husband of the informant and the materials discussed in the impugned order showing that the petitioner had opened the fire which hit in the jaw of the informant's husband and the injury is said to be grievous in



nature, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage. The petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after six months if the trial is not concluded.

The application is dismissed accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Rishi/-

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

Note: The ordersheet duly signed has been attached with the record. However, in view of the present arrangements, during Pandemic period all concerned shall act on the basis of the copy of the order uploaded on the High Court website under the heading 'Judicial Orders Passed During The Pandemic Period'.

