

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5198 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-114 Year-2024 Thana- AGIAON BAZAR District- Bhojpur

1. Arvind Singh @ Arvind Kumar @ Arbind Kumar Singh S/O Baleshwar Singh R/O Vill.- Katariya, P.S.- Agiaon Bazar, Dist.- Bhojpur
2. Niranjana Singh @ Niranjana Kumar S/O Late Vishnu Dayal Singh R/O Vill.- Katariya, P.S.- Agiaon Bazar, Dist.- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dr.Kamal Deo Sharma, Advocate
For the State : Ms.Meena Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 16-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and

learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners seek bail in connection with Agiaon Bazar P.S. Case No. 114/2024 registered for the offences under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109(1), 117(2) and 3(5) of B.N.S.,

3. As per the prosecution case, on 28.07.2024, the named accused persons attacked with iron rod, *lathi* and *danda* upon the son of the informant. It has been stated that the petitioner no. 2 (Niranjana Singh @ Niranjana Kumar) attacked Rocky Kumar (son of the informant) with iron rod due to which he sustained head injury, subsequently, it is



alleged that the petitioner no. 1 (Arvind Singh) is said to have assaulted one Ravi Ranjan with iron rod on his head due to which he sustained head injury. Later, Rocky Kumar (son of the informant) during the course of treatment, died.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case. Learned counsel further submits that there is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioners and no incriminating articles were recovered from the possession of the petitioners. Learned counsel lastly submits that chargesheet has already been submitted in this case and the petitioners have clean antecedent and they are languishing in custody since 30.07.2024.

5. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners and submits that there is specific allegation against petitioner no. 2 that he has assaulted the son of the informant who during the course of treatment had died and that petitioner no. 1 has assaulted one Ravi Ranjan due to which he sustained grievous injury on his head.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and



circumstances of the case and taking into account that there is specific allegation of assault on both the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of bail to the above-named petitioners. The prayer for bail is, accordingly, rejected.

7. This application stands dismissed.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

tusharika/-

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

