

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44777 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-780 Year-2023 Thana- MOTIHARI TOWN District- East
Champaran

Ranjit Singh son of Umashankar Singh Village- Jamala W.No-6, Ps- Motihari
Muffasil Dist- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s
Versus
The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Kumari Anjali, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Anita Kumari, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Madhurendra Kumar, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

4 26-10-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State, learned counsel for the informant and perused
the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in Motihari Town P.S.
Case No. 780 of 2023, instituted for the offences punishable
under Sections 302, 34, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code and
Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, some
unknown persons fired upon the son of the informant due to
which he sustained fire arm injuries and also succumbed to his
injuries.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner has been implicated in this case due to earlier dispute. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged occurrence. It is further submitted that son of the informant was murdered by some unknown miscreants. The petitioner is in custody since 26.12.2023 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP for the State further submits that on perusal of the case diary, it appears that the petitioner is named accused in the FIR and there is direct allegation against the petitioner. The witnesses examined during the course of investigation under Section 161 Cr.P.C. vide para-11, 12, 29, 30 and 31 of the case diary have corroborated the version of FIR. Hence the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the nature of accusation against the petitioner and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not



inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. The Trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial expeditiously. However, if the Trial is not concluded within a period six months from the date of receipt/production, the petitioner will have liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the Court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

