

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17329 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-382 Year-2023 Thana- RANIYATALAB District- Patna

Ranjeet Chaudhary Son of Late Ramadhar Choudhary Resident of Village-
Belaur, P.S.- Udwanthnagar, Distt.- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Ms. Kanchan Kumari, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Md. Fahimuddin, APP
For the Informant :	Mr. Shambhu Narayan Singh, Adv.
	Mr. Suraj Kumar Tiwari, Adv.
	Mr. Abhishek Kumar, Adv.

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

ORAL ORDER

4 11-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with

Ranitalab P.S. Case No. 382 of 2023 instituted for the

offences under Sections 302, 120B, 34 of the Indian Penal

Code and 25(1-b)a, 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Prosecution story, in short, is that, petitioner

along with other co-accused persons in furtherance of their

common intention committed murder of the husband of the

informant.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. The petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. and his name has transpires in this case on the basis of the confessional statement of the co-accused Abhishek Kumar who is not named in the F.I.R. recorded before the police which has no evidentiary value in the eye of law. The co-accused, in his confessional statement, has not stated the petitioner's role or his involvement in the conspiracy or had made a plan to execute the murder of the deceased. There is no eye-witness to the alleged occurrence. Even the informant is not the eye-witness in this case. Nothing incriminating has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. There is no allegation of firing against the petitioner rather the same is against the co-accused Abhishek Kumar. Learned counsel further contended that in the entire investigation, no evidence or material has surfaced against this petitioner, and therefore, submitted that the allegations levelled in the FIR are purely based on suspicion. Learned counsel further submitted that petitioner is in custody since 08.10.2024 and has twenty-



seven criminal antecedents out of which in six of them, he has been acquitted as has been stated in Para-3 of the supplementary affidavit. Learned counsel, therefore, prays that the petitioner may be released on bail.

5. On the other hand, 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. Learned counsel for the informant further submitted that during investigation, accused-petitioner, namely, Abhishek Kumar has also accepted his guilt and has also taken the name of the co-accused persons including the petitioner of being involved in the alleged occurrence. Learned counsel for the informant further contended that the petitioner namely Abhishek Kumar was also identified in the T.I. parade. He further submits that the petitioner has altogether twenty-seven criminal antecedents almost of similar nature of offence and, hence, he does not deserve bail of this Court. He further submits that the prayer for bail of the co-accused Ajay Kumar and Abhishek Kumar has already been rejected by this Court vide order dated 21.09.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 47647 of



2024 and analogous case.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into account the rival submissions made on behalf of the parties and materials available on record, the nature and gravity of the offence as also the petitioner having twenty-seven criminal antecedents, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to both the petitioner.

7. The prayer for grant of bail of petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

