

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11685 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-916 Year-2023 Thana- RUPASPUR District- Patna

Pravin Kumar Singh Son of Late Ram Charitra Singh Resident of Village-
Dhanaut, P.S.- Rupaspur, Distt.- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Akash Kumar Mishra, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Shantanu Kumar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Shrawan Kumar, Sr. Advocate
		Ms. Monika Singh, Advocate
		Mr. Krishna Kumar Singh, Advocate

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

ORAL ORDER

3 01-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State as also learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sessions Trial No. 575 of 2024, arising out of Rupaspur P.S. Case No. 916 of 2023 instituted for the offence under Sections 341, 448, 323, 302, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The prosecution case is that on 12.11.2023, a dispute over bricks and drainage led to an altercation where Pravin Kumar Singh (petitioner) and others allegedly assaulted the informant's family. Pravin and Sanjeev Kumar Verma are accused of firing at the informant's father, brother, and uncle,



causing serious injuries. During treatment, the informant's father, Shashi Bhushan Singh, succumbed to his injuries.

4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 18-11-2023. Petitioner bears no criminal antecedent, as per disclosure made in paragraph No. 3 of the bail application.

5. It has been further submitted by the petitioner's counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case due to prior enmity and local village politics. Although the FIR alleges that the petitioner and co-accused Sanjeev Kumar Verma fired at the informant's relatives, later statements by the injured persons shifted blame solely onto the petitioner, omitting Sanjeev's role, which casts doubt on the prosecution's version. The incident appears to have been manipulated to settle personal scores. The petitioner submits that he is innocent and denies committing any offence. Sanjeev Kumar Verma has been allowed bail by this Court vide order dated 29-01-2025, passed in Cr. Misc. No. 77866 of 2024.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner by contending that there is direct allegation against the petitioner, hence, he does not deserve the privilege of



bail.

7. A report from the trial court was called for, wherein it is reported that one witness is examined and trial is likely to be concluded within a period of nine months.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, taking into account the fact that there is direct allegation against the petitioner coupled with the fact that trial has commenced, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer for bail is hereby *rejected*.

9. The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as expeditiously as possible without any undue delay and unnecessary adjournments preferably within a period of nine months from today.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

