

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.27961 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-420 Year-2023 Thana- NAUGACHIA District- Bhagalpur

Pulkit Mandal S/o Late Hitu Mandal R/o vill - Navtoliya Exchange Road,
Naugachia, P.S. - Naugachia, Distt. - Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ranjan Kumar Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Pawan Kumar Chaurasia

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

ORAL ORDER

4 01-08-2024 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 Naugachia P.S. Case No. 420 of 2023 for the offences punishable under Sections 307, 504, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per allegation, while the informant along with his father was present at his field, the accused persons including the petitioner equipped with weapons came there and started abusing and assaulting him. On protest, the accused persons ordered to kill them and thereafter, the petitioner fired on the chest of informant's father by means of rifle, as a result of which, he fell down and started bleeding profously.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted



that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case due to some ulterior motive and dirty politics to malign the petitioner. It has further been submitted that except the informant and is relatives, no one is the eye witness to the occurrence. The petitioner is under custody since 15.02.2024.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the allegation against petitioner is to open fire at the informant's father on his chest, due to which he sustained serious gun-shot injury. In paragraph nos. 3 and 4 of the case diary, the witnesses have supported the prosecution case.

6. Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances as well as the gravity of the allegation, I do not think it to be a fit case for bail, which is hereby rejected.

7. However, if so advised, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge or after a period of six months, whichever may be earlier.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Nirmal/-

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

