

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67400 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-243 Year-2024 Thana- SAHEBGANJ District- Muzaffarpur

Ravi Singh @ Ravi Ranjan Singh Son of Sikindra Singh Village- somgadh,
Ps- Sahebganj, Dist- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Harsh Anuj

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Sangeeta Sharma

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 13-12-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 302, 120B and 34 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has antecedent of one case, but in the said case
also, he has been discharged by the learned ADJ-XIV,
Muzaffarpur in Sessions Trial No. 407/2022 as such as of date,
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent. It is next
submitted that the informant alleges that his son (deceased)
works at Arunachal Pradesh and on 05.05.2024, he had come
home and used to roam around with Kamlesh, further on
12.05.2024 at 11.00A.M., Kamlesh took his son on a motorcycle



for roaming around, but at 1.30 P.M., the Chaukidar informed that his son has been shot at the High School and has been taken to the hospital, accordingly the informant reached the hospital where his son was declared dead by the doctor. It is next alleged that Vicky, petitioner and Abhishek always stay with Kamlesh, thus alleges that based on suspicion, the accused were involved in killing of his son.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case based on suspicion. It is next submitted that neither the Chaukidar nor the informant is an eye witness to the occurrence. It is next submitted that Rohit was arrested, who confessed that he along with Niraj and Sudhanshu fired at the deceased, thereafter, Sudhanshu was also arrested and he also confessed that he along with Niraj killed the deceased; and Rohit was involved in the occurrence. The learned counsel thus submits that neither Rohit nor Sudhanshu has alleged anything against the petitioner about his involvement in the occurrence. It is also submitted that petitioner is in custody since 14-5-2024 and charge-sheet has been submitted as such no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody. It is next submitted that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the trial to



prove his innocence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner, let the petitioner above named be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Sahebganj P. S. Case No.243 of 2024.

7. However, it is made clear that if the learned trial court comes to a conclusion that the petitioner after his release is trying to delay the trial in any manner, the learned trial court shall be liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

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

