

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28828 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-43 Year-2022 Thana- SAHPUR District- Patna

Ramjeet Kumar @ Ramjeet Ray, S/O Mahendra Ray R/O 394, Nh- 30, Airtel Tower -01, Daudpur, Ward No. 03, Danapur Cantt,P.S.- Shahpur, Dist.- Patna, Bihar-801502

... .. Petitioner/S

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma- Sr. Advocate Mr. Ashutosh Singh
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Bal Mukund Prasad Sinha Mr. Ghanshyam Tiwary

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 29-09-2022 Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner,
learned counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 120B/ 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

The learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has antecedent of three cases, but all the cases are complaint cases as has been stated in the supplementary affidavit and not named in the F.I.R. and submits that his name transpired in the confessional statement of Satyendra Rai in a case of double murder case. It is next submitted that admittedly the confessional statement of a co-accused in police custody



does not have any evidentiary value. It is next submitted that petitioner is no way related with Neelu Devi, nor he had any interest in the land and the deceased, who was elder brother-in-law of Neelu Devi. It is also submitted that whatever dispute with respect to the land was there that was between Neelu Devi, informant and the deceased and petitioner is an outsider, as such, there was absolutely no occasion for him to commit the occurrence.

The learned senior counsel for the petitioner next realizes on the order dated 28.06.2022 in Cr. Misc. No.27202 of 2022 and adopts the argument made therein and submits that the petitioner's case is also on similar footing and hence, the petitioner also deserves to be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

The learned counsel for the informant as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposes the anticipatory bail application.

Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like



amount each to the satisfaction of learned Court below where the case is pending in connection with Shahpur P. S. Case No.43 of 2022, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

