

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.70168 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-164 Year-2022 Thana- BARARI District- Katihar

=====

SHRIKANT SINGH S/O LATE YOGENDRA PRASAD SINGH Resident of
Village- Dahra, P.S.- Barari(Semapur), District- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amrendra Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Uday Chand Prasad, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH
ORAL ORDER

- 3 27-04-2023 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned APP for the State.
2. Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Barari (Semapur) P.S. Case No.164 of 2022 dated 11.06.2022 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 302, 341, 307, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.
3. As per the prosecution, the informant alleged that this petitioner shot his father at his neck and later on due to said gun shot the informant's father succumbed to the fire-arm injury during the course of treatment.
4. The main submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner are that the petitioner is a Government teacher, in fact he was not present at the place of



occurrence at the time of commission of the alleged offence, the informant is not an eye witness of the alleged occurrence and due to political rivalry the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present matter.

5. Learned APP appearing for the State has opposed the bail prayer and submitted that there is specific and serious allegation against the petitioner.

6. Heard both the sides and perused the FIR and the case diary of this case. There is serious allegation against the petitioner and he is stated to be the main assailant who fired at the informant's father which resulted in his death and admittedly there was political enmity in between the petitioner and the deceased and one person namely Narayan Mandal is stated to be eye witness of the alleged occurrence who supported the allegation in his statement recorded by him during investigation. Considering the seriousness of the allegation appearing against the petitioner, in the opinion of this Court the petitioner does not deserve to the privilege of bail. Accordingly, his bail prayer stands rejected.

As according to petitioner's counsel, the trial of the petitioner has started, hence the trial Court is directed to expedite the trial of this petitioner and take steps to conclude the



same in the next one and half year. If the trial of the petitioner is not concluded within the said period then the petitioner may renew his bail prayer.

(Shailendra Singh, J)

sangam/-

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

