

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28754 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-501 Year-2014 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

Vikram Kumar S/O Randhir Singh Residet of Village- Madhaul, P.S.- Runni
Saidpur, District- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Kumar Dhirendra Pratap Singh
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Pramod Kumar Pandey- A.P.P.
	Mr. Gaurav Kumar
	Mr. Ankit Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 3 06-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of
the informant.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in Runni Saidpur P. S.
Case No. 501 of 2014 registered for the offences punishable
under Sections 302, 307, 120B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code
land Section 27 of the Arms Act.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
inadvertently at Para-3 of the bail application, it has been
pleaded that petitioner has antecedent of one case, when he has
antecedent of three cases. It is next submitted that the informant
alleges that the accused persons including the petitioner
indulged in indiscriminate firing causing firearm injury to his



brother and sister in-law. Further, the sister in-law died on account of firearm injury suffered.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that there is no specific allegation of firing against the petitioner rather the allegation of firing is general and omnibus in nature.

5. Learned A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the bail application. It is submitted that the case is of the Year 2014 and the petitioner was arrested in the Year 2020 i.e. six years after the occurrence. It is also submitted that from the post mortem of the sister in-law of the informant, it would manifest that she had received three gunshot injury and the trial has commenced. It is next submitted that petitioner was evading the law for six years and in the event, if he is granted the privilege of bail, he may abscond when trial has commenced, as charges have been framed.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on



bail.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for bail stands rejected.

8. At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no doubt, trial has commenced but not a single witness till date has been examined.

9. Let a copy of this order be sent to the District Magistrate, Sitamarhi and the Superintendent of Police, Sitamarhi for their perusal. The District Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police, Sitamarhi shall ensure that the prosecution witnesses are produced in the trial without any delay.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

