

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.55969 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-134 Year-2019 Thana- HATHUA District- Gopalganj

VISHAL SINGH Son of Ram Pravesh Singh Resident of Village - Matihani
Madho, P.S.- Mirganj, District - Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Raghav Prasad

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Raj Kishor Singh

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

ORAL ORDER

5 21-04-2023 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well
as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioner is seeking regular bail in connection
with Hathua P.S. Case No. 134 of 2019, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal
Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

The informant of this case is driver of Gyandeo
Puri. As per allegation, on 09.07.2019, the informant
proceeded to Gopalganj Court by Vitara Brezza car, along
with his employer Gyandeo Puri. From Gopalganj Court,
they proceeded to participate in *Shradh Karm* ceremony of
one Anil Tiwari. After attending his *Shradh* ceremony, the
deceased was returning to his house. Meanwhile, five



accused persons, on two motorcycles came there and shot dead the deceased.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that except confessional statement of the accused, there is nothing against the petitioner in the entire case diary.

On the other hand, the learned APP has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that not only the petitioner has confessed his guilt but other co-accused persons have also confessed their guilt. He has submitted further that criminal history of the petitioner is on page no. 30 of the case diary, which shows that he is involved in 18 cases amongst which some are of serious nature. The confessional statement of the petitioner shows that he, is indulged in kidnapping cases for ransom and due to non-payment of ransom, he along with other co-accused persons killed the deceased. He has also submitted that in paragraph no. 3 of the bail petition, the petitioner has disclosed only 9 cases, whereas from perusal of page no. 30 of the case diary, it appears that he is involved in 18 cases.

In my view, the petitioner does not deserve the



privileges of bail, which is hereby rejected.

The learned Registrar General is directed to take appropriate steps as per law against the erring person, after conducting an inquiry, for providing false information in paragraph no. 3 of the bail petition.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Nirmal/Kundan

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

