

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47773 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-147 Year-2022 Thana- SONO District- Jamui

SONU DUBEY @ SONU KUMAR DUBEY SON OF ARUN KUMAR
DUBEY RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- DEHRIDIH, PS- KHAIRA, DISTT-
JAMUI

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pankaj Kumar Sinha, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Aditya Narayan Singh.1, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 26-07-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

Petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sono P.S.
Case No. 147 of 2022 registered under Sections 307 and 34 of
IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act. He is stated to be in
custody since 22.05.2022.

As per prosecution case, the informant was carrying
his cement load when the petitioner has fired upon him.

Earlier, the petitioner's prayer for bail was rejected on
11-01-2023 vide Annexure-1. The same has been renewed after
rejection by the learned trial Court of Addl. Sessions Judge-3,
Jamui on 17.06.2023. The rejection by the trial Court is having
due regard to the material collected in the course of



investigation, which reads as follows:-

“After going through hearing from both sides and perusing material available on record it transpired that case diary para nos. 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 25, 29, 35, 36, 44, there is direct allegation against the accused/petitioner that he fired at the informant with intent to kill him and the informant received fire-arm injury in his thigh. The doctor found entry wound of 0.5’x 0.5’ on the lateral aspect of left thigh and exit wound was found medial aspect of the left thigh. The doctor opined nature of injury as grievous and dangerous to life. The petitioner has got criminal antecedent vide Khaira P.S. Case No. 14/2021 u/s- 341, 323, 307, 504, 506 IPC and 27 of the Arms Act.”

The overwhelming material collected in the course of investigation and the fact of earlier rejection of the petitioner’s prayer, upon due consideration as also his antecedents in one(1) case is such that the Court is not inclined to take a different view for allowing the petitioner's prayer for bail.

The application is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

uttam/-

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

