

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25005 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-39 Year-2024 Thana- RANIYATALAB District- Patna

=====

Randhir Kumar @ Randheer Kumar S/o- Ramanuj Yadav R/o- Lalganj Sehra
PS- Paliganj District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rakesh Bihari Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Brajendra Nath Pandey

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

2 01-05-2025 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well
as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is seeking regular bail in connection
with Ranitalab P.S. Case No. 39 of 2024 for the offences
punishable under Sections 279 & 304 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution, FIR has been lodged
against the owner of the vehicle. The allegation in the FIR is that
one twelve wheeler Hywa of which registration number was not
there but having Engine No.NHP2111008 and Chassis No.
MBIJJLHD6NPJR7645, has caused accident and hit the truck
which was standing in the direction of informant's husband and
the said truck ran over her husband due to which, four workers
along with the informant's husband died on the spot due to rash
and negligent driving.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted



that that the petitioner is innocent and falsely been implicated in this case. He has further submitted that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. He has also submitted that the Hywa truck of the petitioner was standing nearby and the petitioner who was the driver of the said Hywa, has not caused any accident and his name has been inserted in this case by the police.

5. Learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that from the impugned order, it has been mentioned that in paragraph no. 14 of the case diary, the petitioner was identified in the CCTV footage in which the said accident was captured.

6. Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances as well as the gravity of the allegation, I do not think it to be a fit case for bail, which is hereby rejected.

7. However, the petitioner, if so advised, may renew his prayer for bail after one year from today.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Nirmal/-

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

