

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.61282 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-88 Year-2022 Thana- MOHIUDDIN NAGAR District-
Samastipur

=====

ROHIT KUMAR @ ROHIT KUMAR RAY S/o Sanjeet Rai @ Sanjit Kumar
Roy R/o Village- Matiour, P.S.- Mohiuddinnagar, Distt- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 61401 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-88 Year-2022 Thana- MOHIUDDIN NAGAR District-
Samastipur

=====

RANJEET RAI @ INDRAJEET RAI Son of Late Rajendra Rai R/V- Matiaur,
P.s- Mohiuddin Nagar, Dist- Samastipur Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 61282 of 2022)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bijay Bhushan Prasad

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

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 61401 of 2022)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vaishnavi Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Pranav Kumar

=====

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

4 07-04-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned
counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State.

The petitioner has prayed for bail in a case instituted
for the offence under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code
and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

As per allegation in the FIR, all the FIR named
accused persons including some unknown persons have dashed



the father of the informant from motorcycle and he fell down thereafter, on order of co-accused Rajendra Rai, accused Jaykant Rai shot him fired. On way to hospital of Patna, he succumbed to injuries.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. They have committed no offence. Specific allegation of firing is against Jaykant Rai and not against these petitioners. As per postmortem report, one bullet injury has been found on the body of the deceased and cause of death due to cardio-respiratory failure. Both the petitioners were languishing in judicial custody for more than six months.

The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant and submitted that both the petitioners are named in the FIR.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail. The above named petitioners are directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. ten thousand only) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Additional Chief Judicial magistrate-IV, Samastipur in



connection with Mohiuddinnager P.S. Case No. 88 of 2022.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

sushma/-

U			
---	--	--	--

