

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4506 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-161 Year-2024 Thana- TARARI District- Bhojpur

Munna Singh @ Krishna Singh S/O Yamuna Singh Resident of village-
Sedha, P.S.- Tarari, District- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Ataur Rahman, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 24-04-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Tarari
P.S. Case No. 161 of 2024 instituted for the offences under
Sections 103, 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023 and Section 27 of the
Arms Act.

3. As per prosecution case, the accusation against the
petitioner is of committing murder of the deceased by firing.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged
against him and has falsely been implicated in the present case
due to dirty village politics. The petitioner is not named in the
F.I.R. and his name has transpired in this case in course of



investigation merely on the basis of suspicion. Even the Informant has not disclosed the name of the petitioner. The deceased and the petitioner are agnate. In course of investigation, nothing adverse has come against the petitioner showing his complicity in the alleged occurrence. He further submits that nothing incriminating has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged occurrence. The petitioner has one criminal antecedent in which he is on bail and is languishing in judicial custody since 02.09.2024 without any rhymes or reason. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the trial is going on and one witness has already been examined in this case.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, stating that the offence alleged is serious in nature. He submits that the witness Ashok Singh, who is the eye-witness to the alleged occurrence, has stated in Para-08 of the case diary has seen the petitioner firing upon the deceased. Witness Rishtu Singh has also supported the prosecution case. The witness in Para 9 & 10 of the case diary have also supported the prosecution case. The petitioner in his confessional statement



has also confessed his guilt of committing murder of the deceased. Postmortem report also supports the prosecution case. The Investigating Officer, after completion of investigation, has submitted charge-sheet against the petitioner under Section 103 of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of the Arms Act. In view of the above, the petitioner does not deserve bail.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature and gravity of the offence as also there being direct and specific allegation of firing against the petitioner coupled with the fact that the trial is already in progress, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner, above named, is rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

