

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49749 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-45 Year-2021 Thana- SUPAUL District- Supaul

VICKY RANJAN @ VICKY YADAV SON OF PHULENDRA YADAV R/O
MOHALLA- WARD NO...., NEAR GOLDEN PUBLIC SCHOOL, P.S. AND
TOWN AND DISTRICT- SUPAUL.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Murari Narain Chaudhary

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shailendra Kumar

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

4 07-04-2023 The learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to

remove all the defects pointed out by the office within one

month.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as

Mr. Shailendra Kumar, the learned APP for the State.

In this case, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in

connection with Supaul P.S. Case No. 45 of 2021, registered for

the offences punishable under Sections 394, 302 of the Indian

Penal Code and later on, sections 395 and 412 of the Indian

Penal Code have been added.

As per allegation, the informant along with one

Suresh and Pintu was coming to his house from hospital in the

night of occurrence. Some miscreants stopped his bike. At the



point of pistol, they snatched mobile set of Suresh. They also snatched Rs 5,000/- from the pocket of the informant and they also snatched the mobile set from the possession of Pintu. When Pintu raised hue and cry, one of the miscreants fired shot on his head. He was brought to Supaul Hospital where the doctor declared him as dead.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The other accused persons have been granted bail and the case of the petitioner is on similar footing to the case of co-accused persons, who have been granted bail by the coordinate Benches of this Court.

On the other hand, Mr. Shailendra Kumar the learned APP has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the case of the petitioner cannot be equated with those, who have been granted bail by the coordinate Benches of this Court, as the petitioner is assailant and he was the person, who open fired at the head of the deceased and in his confessional statement, he has confessed his guilt.

In my view, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege for bail, which is hereby rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the



petitioner within the stipulated time mentioned herein above,
failing which, the matter shall be brought to the notice of this
Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudha/Mahesh

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

