

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28432 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-72 Year-2020 Thana- RISIYAP District- Aurangabad

LAVKUSH KUMAR SINGH S/O ARBIND SINGH R/o village- Gurdi, P.S.-
Navinagar, Distt.- Aurangabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ajay Kr. Thakur, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Shiv Pratap
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

6 03-01-2022 Heard Sri Ajay Kumar Thakur, learned senior counsel for
the petitioner and learned counsel for the informant and learned APP
for the State.

Petitioner seeks bail in connection with Risiup P.S. Case no.
72 of 2020 registered for the offence punishable under sections 364,
120B of the Indian Penal Code and later sections 302, 201 IPC and
section 27 of the Arms Act were added.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is in custody since 12.11.2020 and charge sheet has been
submitted and from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it
would manifest that the informant alleges that he along with his
brother Rahul Singh and co-villagers were returning from
Aurangabad court after taking bail in a car, that Deva Singh had also
accompanied them, further that petitioner was driving the car and at
Domuhan bridge accused persons forcibly stopped the car and



petitioner along with other accused persons abducted his brother Rahul. Learned senior counsel submits that since petitioner was driving the car as such accused persons forcibly asked him to accompany them when the petitioner was not willing for the same.

Learned counsel for the informant submits that during the course of investigation, it was found that brother of the informant was killed. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner and brother of the informant (deceased) were travelling in the car who betrayed and got the brother of the informant killed. Learned counsel further submits that had the petitioner not been involved in the occurrence, he would have returned either to the informant or before the police to narrate the occurrence but he got arrested nearly two months after the occurrence which itself demonstrates that petitioner had taken active participation in the occurrence.

Learned APP opposes the prayer for bail also.

Considering the submissions of learned counsel for the informant, the court is not pursuing to enlarge the petitioner on bail and accordingly, his prayer for bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

s.hassan/-

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

