

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10903 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-45 Year-2022 Thana- TATARPUR District- Bhagalpur

Dhananjay Mandal S/o- Kamleshwari Mandal Mohalla- Kajwalichak PS-  
Tatarpur Dist- bhagalpur, P/A- Vill- Kamalpur Ps- Sajour Dist- Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashutosh Kumar, Adv.

For the State : Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

4      06-09-2024                      Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as  
the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is seeking regular bail in connection with the Tatarpur P.S. Case No. 45 of 2022 for the offences under Section 326, 307, 302 and 34 of the I.P.C. and Section 3/4/5 of Explosive Substance Act.

3. The informant, who is ASI on hearing sound of bomb explosion reached to the place of occurrence, he saw that the debris were spread at the place of occurrence and some persons were intercepted in that debris. The ambulance was called and the rescued persons were sent to the hospital. In huge quantity the explosive substances were recovered from the place of occurrence. 14 persons died due to that explosion and the



names of the diseased persons have been mentioned in the FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that there is nothing against the petitioner except confessional statement of co-accused in which he has stated that the petitioner was the supplier of explosive substance.

5. On the other hand, learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail by submitting that petitioner is named in the FIR and he is alleged to be supplier of the alleged explosive substances. He further submitted that 14 persons have lost their lives in the massive explosion and 9 persons became injured. It is next submitted that the petitioner has two criminal antecedents of similar nature. During investigation several witnesses have supported the prosecution case.

6. Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the petitioner has also been made accused in two more cases of similar nature, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the application stands rejected.

**(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)**

Arish/-

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

