

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.61872 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-8 Year-2023 Thana- NOWKOTHI GARHPURA District-  
Begusarai

=====

RAUSHAN KUMAR @ RAUSHAN KUMAR SINGH Son of Shambhu  
Singh Resident of Ward No. 05, Dafarpur, P.S.-Naokothi, District-Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pritish Kumar Lal  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jharkhandi Upadhyay

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

5      22-01-2024                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP  
for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in a case instituted for  
the offence under Sections 147, 148, 149, 302 and 506 of the Indian  
Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, while informant with her  
mother and son, namely, Manaswi Kumar (since deceased) were  
returning to their house after withdrawing an amount of Rs. 30,000/-  
nine miscreants including the petitioner intercepted them and tried to  
snatch the withdrawn amount. On resistance being made by her son,  
the petitioner shot at him which hit below his left eye and co-accused  
Kahhaiya Singh shot at his chest resulting into his spot death.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that  
petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case due to long



standing dispute between both the parties. Allegedly, petitioner has opened fire which hit below the eye of the deceased but as per postmortem report, doctor has found only one gunshot injury on his chest, which was hit by co-accused Kanhaiya Singh. Petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 27.01.2023.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State and submitted that petitioner has confessed his guilt about committing murder of informant's son by means of gunshot. Postmortem report is in consonance with the prosecution story. During investigation, several witnesses have supported the prosecution story.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of allegation, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and, as such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.

7. The trial court is directed to expedite and conclude the trial within nine months, failing which the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

**(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)**

sushma/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

