

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48483 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-695 Year-2023 Thana- JAKKANPUR District- Patna

=====

Ravi @ Ravi Kumar @ Ravi Ranjan Kumar @ Ravi Ranjan @ Karu Son of
Pramod Prasad R/O Mohalla- Bigrahpur, P.S.- Jakkanpur, Dist.- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rabi Bhushan Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Aditya Narayan Singh.1, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 18-09-2024 Heard the learned Advocate for the petitioner and the

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail, who is in custody
in connection with Jakkanpur P.S. Case No. 695 of 2023,
registered for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 323
and 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms
Act.

3. The allegation against the petitioner is of causing
firearm injury to the informant.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner contended that
the FIR clearly suggest the omnibus nature of allegation against
all the accused persons. Even if the allegation taken to be true
against the petitioner of causing firearm injury i.e. on a non vital
part and, as such, no offence much less under Section 307 of the



Indian Penal Code is made out. It is further contended that there is no recovery of any arms or incriminating material from the possession of the petitioner. The petitioner has been incarcerated since 13.03.2024, and now the investigation of the crime is complete and the charge-sheet has been submitted.

5. On the other hand, learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the bail application and submits that the petitioner has a long list of criminal antecedent, which runs nine in number and this suggest that the petitioner is a habitual offender.

6. Regard being had to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and considering the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and the specific accusation of causing firearm injury, this Court is not persuaded to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

7. The petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of the charge.

(Harish Kumar, J)

shivank/-

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

