

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12612 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-167 Year-2023 Thana- SANGRAMPUR District- Munger

Jitendra Singh @ Paltu S/O Karu Singh R/O Village- Tetiya, P.S- Sangrampur
(tetiya Bamber), Distt.- Munger.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ranjeet Patel, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Yogendra Kumar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Jyoti Ranjan Jha, Adv.
		Ms. Kusum Kumari, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 03-05-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Sangrampur P.S. Case No. 167 of 2023, lodged on 03.06.2023 under Sections 302, 379, 34, 201, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code read with section 25(1-b)a, 26(i)(ii), 27, 35 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, FIR has been lodged against two named and two unknown accused persons against whom there is an allegation that they have killed the informant's son. As per the allegation made in the FIR, the case has been filed on the basis of suspicion as there is no eye-witness in the FIR.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. Counsel also submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and his name has been figured in this case only by virtue of confessional statement of accused persons and subsequently by his own confession. Counsel further submits that the criminal antecedent of the petitioner is clean and he is in custody since 08.06.2023. Counsel also submits that the charge-sheet has already been submitted in this case. Counsel submits that other co-accused persons namely Bhupesh Kumar and Sudhakar Kumar has been granted bail by this Court *vide* order dated 16.04.2024 and 21.03.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. Nos. 9530 of 2024 and 83753 of 2023 respectively.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner in the confession has stated the entire *modus operandi* about the case. Counsel also submits that as per his knowledge, charge has not been framed in this case.

7. In the present facts and circumstances of this case and the submissions made above, **let the petitioner above**



named be granted bail, but only after framing of charge, if not framed on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.30,000/- (Rupees Thirty thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional Judicial Magistrate 1st Class AM-V, Munger in connection with Sangrampur P.S. Case No. 167 of 2023, subject to the conditions as laid down U/s 437(3) Cr.P.C.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Divyansh/-

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

