

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60934 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-101 Year-2020 Thana- PANAPUR District- Saran

Rais Miyan @ Rakatu Miyan Son of Late Israil Miyan Resident of Village -  
Panapur, P.S.- Panapur, District - Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Harish Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Jha, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

6      02-12-2024

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Panapur P.S.Case no.101 of 2020 registered under sections 302, 201 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner along with four others are said to have assaulted the father of the informant leading to his death.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. Even the allegations in the FIR are general and omnibus in nature. The informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence. Coaccused Anwar Miya and Wakil Miya have been enlarged on bail vide order dated 14.9.2022 passed Cr. Misc. no.42309 of



2022 and order dated 23.11.2022 passed in Cr. Misc. no.62287 of 2022 respectively. The case of the petitioner stands on a better footing in so far as while the petitioner is 70 years old, the other coaccused who were granted bail are aged 26 years each. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent. He is in custody since 14.7.2020 and chargesheet has been submitted in the case.

5. Heard learned A.P.P. for the State.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegations against the petitioner in the F.I.R. wherein the petitioner along with other named coaccused are said to have assaulted the father of the informant leading to his death, the other coaccused having been enlarged on bail after having remained in custody for over 2 years and in the facts of the case, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.

7. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail after six months or on framing of charge whichever is later.

**(Partha Sarthy, J)**

Bibhash

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

