

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14419 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-9 Year-2022 Thana- DULHIN BAZAR District- Patna

AJIT KUMAR @ AJIT S/o Raj Kishor Singh R/o Village- Sabazpura, P.S.-
Dulhin Bazar, Distt- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. K.P. Singh, Sr. Adv. Mr. Rakesh Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Upendra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

4 31-07-2023 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 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 307, 302, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, 13 accused persons including the petitioner encircled the Prahlad Singh, husband of the informant and with common intention to kill him and opened fire. Specific allegation against petitioner, co-accused Sanju Kumar and Subhash Kumar opened three shots out of which one bullet hit her husband chest and he died on spot. One persons, namely, Ankur Kumar also received gun-shot injury.



4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case due to election dispute of ward member. Both parties are co-villagers. Allegation levelled against the petitioner is false and baseless. Similarly situated other accused person has already been enlarged on bail by another coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 11.08.2022 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 25490 of 2022. Petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 20.09.2022.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State. During investigation, several witnesses have supported the prosecution case. Allegedly, petitioner has opened fire upon the deceased, which fact is corroborated by the Medical report. Deceased had received five bullet injuries and doctor opined cause of death due to bullet injuries.

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. Progress report dt. 6.7.2023 suggests that charge has not been framed in this case as yet. And trial court sought for six months time for concluding the trial.

8. The trial court is directed to expedite and conclude the trial within the stipulated period of six months as mentioned in



the progress report, failing which the petitioner will be at liberty to
renew his prayer for bail.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

sushma/-

U			
---	--	--	--

