

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6188 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-126 Year-2019 Thana- RAGHOPUR District- Vaishali

RANVIJAY RAI @ VIJAY RAI Son of Late Lal Bahadur Rai Resident of
Village - Sukumarpur, P.S. - Raghopur, District - Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ansul, Advocate Mr. Pramod Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Mahendra Thakur Mr. Akshay Lal Pandit, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 16-02-2022 Heard Mr. Ansul, learned counsel for the petitioner ,

Mr. Mahendra Thakur, learned counsel for the informant and

Mr. Akshay Lal Pandit, learned A.P.P. for the State through

video conferencing.

Petitioner has renewed his prayer for regular bail in
connection within Raghopur P.S. Case No. 126 of 2019
registered for the offence under Sections 147, 148, 149, 341,
342, 323, 326, 354, 307, 302, 201, 120(B), 504 of the I.P.C. and
Section 27 of the Arms Act within two months of last rejection
of his bail application vide Cr. Misc. No. 28203 of 2021.

This court earlier while rejecting the bail application
of the petitioner on 15-12-2021 has recorded the finding that the
court was not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, upon which
petitioner sought withdrawal of the bail application and the
same was dismissed as withdrawn. Now, the petitioner is trying
to submit that it was dismissed as withdrawn due to the fact that
criminal antecedent of the petitioner was not properly stated in



paragraph no. 3 of previous bail application but now he has stated all the criminal antecedents of the petitioner.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the informant submits that it is a case of triple murder and the petitioner is one of the assailants and the bail application of similarly situated co-accused / Jaikant Rai has been rejected by a Co-ordinate Bench of this court in Cr. Misc. No. 27850 of 2021 and other accused persons, whose bail applications have been allowed by this court, they have obtained bail by suppressing material facts.

Regard being had to the submissions made by the parties and taking into consideration the fact that bail application of the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn by the previous order and within two months of the dismissal of the 1st bail application, the petitioner has renewed his prayer for bail, as such, I am not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the same is rejected.

However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after one year from today.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

praful/-

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

