

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1424 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-116 Year-2023 Thana- SHASTRINAGAR District- Patna

Shivjee @ Shivjee Kumar S/O Sri Chandra Bhushan Sao Resident Of
Indrapuri Road, Ps. Patliputra, Dist.Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar Thakur, Adv Ms. Vaishnavi Singh, Adv Mr. Ritwik Thakur, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 06-09-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State, Shri Chandra Bhushan Prasad.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Shastri
Nagar PS Case No. 116 of 2023 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 302 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code
and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has antecedent of one case and has been falsely
implicated in the instant case by the informant who alleges that
accused persons including the petitioner and some unknown
accused shot his grandson near a *Chowmein* shop leading to his
death.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
Anand Kumar Singh @ Anand had approached this Court by
filing Cr. Misc No. 22117 of 2023 and the same was allowed by



an order dated 11-7-2023.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the order dated 11-7-2023 in Cr. Misc No. 22117 of 2023 on which reliance is placed by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, it would manifest that the same records that in the confessional statement of the apprehended accused, the name of Anand Kumar Singh @ Anand did not transpire, but then what transpired was that it was this petitioner who had planned and executed the murder of the deceased. It is also submitted that the petitioner was even seen in the CCTV footage where the occurrence had taken place, further even the tower location of his mobile also corroborates his presence at the place of occurrence.

6. Considering the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

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

