

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14021 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-149 Year-2022 Thana- PATNA CITY CHOWK District- Patna

ROHIT KUMAR @ GOLU S/O AMARNATH YADAV R/o- Kathotiya Gali,
P.S.- Chowk, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pramod Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

3 08-09-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Chowk P.S. Case No. 149 of 2022 instituted for the offence under Sections 302, 120(b), 386, 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, the petitioner along with co-accused Ranjeet Kumar @Belchhi are alleged to have shot fire upon the deceased namely, Pramod Kumar Bagla due to which he sustained gun shot injury and died. The alleged occurrence took place as the accused persons including the petitioner were demanding extortion from the deceased who is owner of the Til Oil Factory.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner is innocent and committed no offence. He has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 8.4.2022.

5. Learned APP appearing for the state has opposed the prayer of regular bail and submitted that the petitioner is named in the FIR who has specifically been alleged that he along with co-accused shot fire upon the deceased namely, Pramod Kumar Bagla due to which he sustained gun shot injuries and thereafter he died. The postmortem report which is mentioned in impugned order has also supported the prosecution case in which, doctor opined that cause of death is due to injuries caused by bullets.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that there is direct allegation against the petitioner, 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 expedite the trial and conclude the same within a period of one year, failing which, the petitioner may renew his prayer of bail.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

lata/-

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

