

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28179 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-339 Year-2024 Thana- JANDAHA District- Vaishali

Veer Bahadur Singh son of Late Mukundchand Singh village - Singyahi, Ps-
Jandaha, Dist- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kr. Thakur, Adv.
Mrs. Vaishnavi Singh, Adv.
Mr. Ritwik Thakur, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pawan Kumar Chaurasia, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

3 09-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

APP for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with

Jandaha P.S. Case No. 339 of 2024 instituted for the

offences under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118, 109, 326(f),

326(g), 324(4), 324(5), 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the Bhartiya

Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and, later on added Section 103(1) of

the B.N.S.

3. As per prosecution case, the allegation against the

petitioner is of firing the thatched huts, assaulting and

threatening the Informant and, in association with other co-



accused, to badly injuring the old-aged mother-in-law of the Informant. It is also alleged that the injured Ramiya Devi succumbed to her injury after two weeks of the occurrence.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged against him and has falsely been implicated in the present case only due to longstanding land dispute. There is an admitted land dispute between the parties. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the medical report does not support the prosecution case as in the medical report, only one lacerated injury has been found on the scalp but, as per allegation, three persons had allegedly assaulted the deceased. There is also no specific or direct allegation of assault against the petitioner. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. The petitioner has two criminal antecedents and, in both of them, he is on bail and is languishing in judicial custody since 27.09.2024 without any rhymes or reason. Learned counsel for the petitioner again submits that the co-accused namely Ranjeet Kumar has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated



27.03.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 585 of 2025.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, stating that the offence alleged is serious in nature. He further submits that there is direct allegation against the petitioner of assaulting the mother-in-law of the Informant who succumb to her injury. The injury reports supports the prosecution case. The postmortem report also supports the prosecution case, indicating the cause of death due to head injury by hard and blunt substance. The Informant in the re-statement and several witnesses in Para 2, 3, 9 and 65 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case. The Investigating Officer, after completion of investigation, has submitted charge-sheet under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118, 109, 326(f), 326(g), 324(4), 324(5), 352, 351(2), 103(1), 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature and gravity of the offence as alleged against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.



7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner, above named, is rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously preferably within a period of six months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of six months as stated above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

