

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52292 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-28 Year-2021 Thana- KOCHAS District- Rohtas

Chunnu Ray @ Sarvottam Ray @ Sarvottam Kumar Ray S/O Late Abhay  
Narayan Ray Resident Of Village- Salathua, P.S.- Kudra, District- Kaimur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Raj Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Umesh Lal Verma

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

9      30-08-2023                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP  
for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with  
Kochas (Parsathua O.P.) P.S. Case No. 28 of 2021 instituted for  
the offence under Sections 302, 307, 120(B) and 34 of the Indian  
Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

Allegation against the petitioner is that he instigated  
the two other co-accused persons for firing upon the informant's  
brother and after that both of the co-accused persons  
indiscriminately opened fire upon the informant's brother due to  
which the victim succumbed to injuries of firing.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that  
petitioner has been falsely implicated in this present case. It is  
further submitted that petitioner has not made any firing upon the



victim only he is order giver in the alleged offence. Moreover, he is languishing in judicial custody since 12.05.2022.

Learned APP appearing for the state and learned counsel for the informant have opposed the prayer of regular bail and submitted that the petitioner is named in FIR and the petitioner was present at the place of occurrence and he instigated the co-accused persons to fire upon the informant's brother due to which the victim succumbed to injuries. It is further submitted that the trial of this case is likely to be concluded and trial is pending for on behalf of the defence. It is also submitted that from perusal of the report of the trial Court, this case is fixed for argument.

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.

The application stands disposed of.

The trial court is directed to conclude the trial within one month.

**(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)**

Shubham/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

