

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18725 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1000 Year-2024 Thana- HAJIPUR SADAR District- Vaishali

Rajeev Ranjan, (Male), aged about 46 years, Son of Shri Ram Prasad, R/O
village- Rampuram, Road No. 15 E, P.S.- Rajiv Nagar, Dist- Patna

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Ansul, Sr. Advocate and Mr. Anuj Kumar, Advocate
For the Informant	:	M/S. Binod Kumar Sinha and Ajay Kumar Prasad, Advocates
For the State	:	Mrs. Renu Kumari, A.P.P.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

4 16-06-2025 Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Hajipur
Sadar P.S. Case No. 1000 of 2024 dated 26.12.2024 registered
for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 109, 61(2),
351(2), 351(3) of the B.N.S., 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms
Act. Later on, Section 103 of the B.N.S., 2023 was also added.

3. As per the prosecution case, on 25.12.2024 at about
11.35 A.M., the informant received an information through
someone on phone that her husband sustained firearms injury
and was lying on *Ekara Flyover* in an injured condition and was
brought to Sadar Hospital through 112 Dial. On which, she



alongwith others went to Sadar Hospital from where seeing his critical condition, he was referred to Patna. It is further alleged that brother of the informant Suraj Kumar, niece Rahul Kumar and other two villagers were with the husband of the informant in the Ambulance and he was admitted to Ruban Memorial Hospital. It is further alleged that during the transit of the husband of the informant from Hajipur to Patna, he told the brother of the informant that one builder of Patna, Rajeev Ranjan (petitioner) who is connected with Flipkart Company situated in Dhobghatti, is the person who got him shot by another person. It is further alleged that earlier also the petitioner had threatened to shoot the husband of the informant. Additionally, it has been alleged that the petitioner and his 14-15 associates had come to her residence at Hajipur and threatened to kill her husband. The informant contends that her husband was shot on at the instance of the petitioner. The phone numbers of Rajeev Ranjan (petitioner) is 9431277772 and 7277777772 who runs a company in the name of Sri Ram Group.

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. The informant is not an eye witness to the alleged offence rather she was informed about the



occurrence by one Hritik Kumar on the phone. The said Hritik Kumar found the deceased lying injured and accompanied him to the hospital with the assistance of Dial 112 services. The deceased informed Hritik Kumar that two unidentified persons arrived on a motorcycle and shot him but the deceased did not name the petitioner at the crucial moment. It is further submitted that during the course of investigation, the informant mentioned that the occurrence was audio recorded by the said Hritik Kumar which was later confirmed by the Patrolling Officer of Team 112 Emergency Service, Ranjan Pandey, however, this audio recording was submitted to the police in a pen drive on 24.01.2025 which is after a delay of 22 days i.e., after death of the deceased. This significant delay raises doubts regarding the authenticity and integrity of the evidence, creating a substantial question of its reliability. The said Hritik Kumar has also filed a written information before the court of learned C.J.M., Vaishali at Hajipur, mentioning therein with respect to the alleged occurrence and also mentioned that when he inquired about the assailants, the deceased responded that he did not know who had shot him which shows that the deceased did not name the petitioner in the alleged offence and he had also asked the deceased about who could be behind the alleged incident, the



deceased did not take any names during the course of the conversation. It is further submitted that the informant has mentioned in the F.I.R. that 10-15 days prior to the present incident, the petitioner alongwith 14-15 of his associates had come to her residence and threatened her husband to kill him but neither the deceased nor the informant had given any information to the police. No incriminating article has been recovered from his possession. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged offence. The petitioner has clean antecedent as stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail application. The petitioner is in custody in this case since 27.12.2024.

5. Learned counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the State have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail petition of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the informant has further submitted that in paragraph nos. 28, 29 and 48 of the case diary, the witnesses have supported the prosecution case. He further submitted that the paragraph no. 53 of the case diary which is the postmortem report also supported the prosecution case. As per the postmortem report, the cause of death is due to Haemorrhage and shock resulting from above mentioned injuries caused by projectile firearm.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of



the case as well as nature of accusation against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and the same is rejected in connection with Hajipur Sadar P.S. Case No. 1000 of 2024, pending in the court of learned C.J.M. Vaishali at Hajipur.

7. The application stands rejected.

8. The learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial of the petitioner and conclude the same at the earliest.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

U.K./-

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

