

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.21201 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-74 Year-2021 Thana- MATIHANI District- Begusarai

Shankar Singh, Son of Late Sonelal Singh @ Late Sona Singh @ Sonelal Singh, Resident of village- Ramdiri, Nakti, Ward No. 06, P.S. - Matihani, District - Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sandip Kumar Gautam, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Priya Sharan Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 27-07-2022 Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to remove the defect(s), as pointed out by the office, within a period of four weeks from today.

Heard Mr. Sandip Kumar Gautam, learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned APP for the State.

The petitioner seeks regular bail, who is in custody in connection with Matihani P.S. case no. 74 of 2021 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 307, 504, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

As per the prosecution case, it is alleged that on account of land dispute, this petitioner shot fire upon the informant causing two grievous firearm injuries over his



shoulder and the waist.

It is submitted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that the alleged occurrence has taken place on 13.06.2021. However, the present F.I.R. has been instituted after a delay of two days i.e. on 15.06.2021, which shows the deliberation of the informant. It is further submitted that though there is allegation of firing against the petitioner, but the injury report does not specifically corroborate the allegation and only because of the land dispute his name has been implicated. It is also submitted that the injury report has been obtained by the private hospital. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 19.01.2021.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the bail application and submits that there is specific allegation against the petitioner.

Having regard to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and considering the specific nature of allegation and gravity of the offence, as also the multiple criminal antecedent of the petitioner, this Court is not persuaded to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

However, it is expected that the learned trial court



would take all the necessary step to conclude the trial at the
earliest.

(Harish Kumar, J)

uday/-

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

