

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.66401 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-332 Year-2020 Thana- MOTIHARI TOWN District- East
Champaran

=====

Rajan Sahani, Son of Ramraj Sahani, Resident of Village- Raghunathpur,
Ward No. 2, P.S.- Turkauliya Raghunathpur O.P., District- East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. P.K. Shahi, Sr. Advocate
Mr.Karandeep Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Parmanand Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

7 13-09-2022 Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

Let the defect (s), as pointed out by the office, be removed within a period of four weeks from the date of resumption of physical filing and physical removal of defect.

In the present case, the petitioner seeks bail in connection with Town P.S. Case No. 332 of 2020 (Tr. No.1045 of 2021), registered for the alleged offences under Sections 3147, 148, 149, 324, 326, 307 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

As per the prosecution case, on saying of the co-accused persons, this petitioner shot at the informant who after receiving injury on his right chest fell down. When one Karan



Gupta tried to intervene, the petitioner also shot at him in his abdomen and further fired upon Karan Gupta hitting in his leg.

Mr. P.K. Shahi, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he was not present at the spot. The injury report does not corroborate the allegation as levelled in the FIR. The petitioner is in custody since 30.10.2020. The charge sheet has been submitted and the charges are yet to be framed in this case.

Learned APP opposes the prayer for bail submitting that there is specific allegation against this petitioner who shot at two persons and this petitioner is also accused in a number of cases and is a habitual offender.

Perused the records.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances and considering the specific allegation against the petitioner for shooting at and causing firearm injury on two persons, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage.

Accordingly, his prayer for bail is rejected.

However, as the petitioner is in custody since 30.10.2020, the learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously preferably within a



period of nine months.

If the trial is not concluded within the aforesaid period of nine months, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

V.K.Pandey/-

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

