

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25155 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-160 Year-2024 Thana- DHANSOI District- Buxar

=====

Suman Singh @ Raj Kumar Singh @ Raju Kumar Singh Son of Late Anil
Singh Resident of Village- Chilhar, P.S.- Itarhi, District- Buxar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dr.Kamal Deo Sharma, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Bhanu Pratap Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 07-05-2025 Heard Mr.Dr.Kamal Deo Sharma,learned counsel for

the petitioner and Mr.Bhanu Pratap Singh, learned Additional

Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Dhansoi P.S.Case No.160 of 2024,FIR dated
08.11.2024 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 191(2),191(3),190,109,352 of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita,
2023 and Section 27 of Arms Act.

3. Prosecution case in short is that, the present case
has been instituted on the basis of typed application of
informant Jitendra Singh, who has alleged therein that, on
08.11.2024 at 4.30 P.M. his son Rahul Kumar was sitting at his
door with her mother when his co-villagers namely Mukesh
Singh, Uttam Singh, Abhishek Singh, Suman Singh and 10 other



unknown persons came there firing on motorcycle. Mukesh Singh shot his son Rahul Kumar @ Raja in his stomach and when informant his family members reached there, the accused persons fled away firing.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. The allegation as alleged in the FIR is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR. From a bare perusal of the FIR it transpired that although the petitioner is named in the FIR but there is specific allegation of firing attributed against co-accused person, namely, Mukesh Singh and at best the petitioner may be a member of the mob.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner carries two more cases other than the present one but fairly submits that the petitioner is on bail in both the cases, as mentioned in para-3 of the bail petition.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts, there is no specific allegation of any assault or firing attributed against the petitioner and specific allegation of firing attributed against co-accused person, namely, Mukesh Singh, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the court



below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000 (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Buxar in connection with Dhansoi P.S.Case No.160 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/ Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 and with other following conditions:-

(I) Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court and shall remain physically present as directed by the Court and on his/her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his/her bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

(II) If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(III) And, further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his/her criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order



shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of
verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

