

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48060 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-168 Year-2021 Thana- TAJPUR District- Samastipur

NAVIN KUMAR @ NAVIN KUMAR SINGH Son of Ashok Kumar Singh
Resident of Village- Fatehpur Bala, Tole Nasi, P.S.- Musrigharari, District-
Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sachin Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 30-03-2022 Let the defects, as pointed out by the office, be removed within four weeks of starting of Court proceeding in physical mode in normal course.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offence under Sections 302 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

The elder son of the informant is said to have been killed by the petitioner and others by inflicting gun shot injuries.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case merely on the basis of suspicion. He further submits that there is land dispute between the petitioner and the



deceased and on account of that, the petitioner has been implicated in this case. He further submits that there is no eye witness to the alleged occurrence. The petitioner is rotting in judicial custody since 29.04.2021.

On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has, vehemently, opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and referring to paragraph Nos. 37 and 38 of the case diary, he submits that the petitioner has opened fire upon the deceased as a result of which, he died. Moreover, the prosecution witnesses have also supported the prosecution version. He also submits that the postmortem report also corroborates with the allegation leveled against the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner carries four more cases other than the present one. Hence, the petitioner may not be enlarged on bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of this petitioner is rejected.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

brajesh/-

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

