

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7609 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-472 Year-2021 Thana- SASARAM MUFFSIL District- Rohtas

=====

SUNNY DEOL @ DHANJEE S/O RANGLAL PASWAN R/v-
Chandrakaithi, P.S.- Chenari, District- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jai Prakash Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rita Verma

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

4 22-08-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in a case instituted
for the offence under Sections 302, 307, 394 of the Indian Penal
Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per prosecution case, the informant, who happens
to be driver of the truck, after loading the truck by P.H.E.D. pipes
from Bokaro started his journey towards M.P. along with his co-
driver and helper. It is further alleged that when they reached at
mountain hotel at Dhankara, he stopped the truck for checking the
tyre and other parts of the truck, after checking when he started the



truck, in the meantime, three persons intercepted them and demanded for money but on refusal two persons fired on them, due to which one of them got injured by fire-arm, who later on succumbed to injury.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He has committed no offence. Petitioner is not named in the FIR and the same has been lodged against unknown persons. He submitted that the name of the petitioner has come into light, on the basis of confessional statement of other co-accused. Petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 13.06.2022.

5. Learned APP for the State has opposed the application for bail and submitted that this petitioner was identified in T.I. Parade by the informant as he has involved in the said occurrence. From the perusal of the progress report submitted by trial Court, it appears that most of the prosecution witnesses have been examined and the trial is likely to be concluded in the near future. During investigation several witnesses have also supported the prosecution case.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of allegation, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and, as such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.



7. The trial Court is directed to conclude the trial within three months, without fail, failing which the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

arish/-

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

