

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30134 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-114 Year-2023 Thana- PUSA District- Samastipur

Sanni Ram @ Sunni Ram S/o Arun Ram R/o Village- Mahmada, P.S.- Pusa,
District- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mahendra Pratap

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Md. Matloob Rab

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 20-06-2025 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned APP for the State.

2. This is the 2nd attempt of the petitioner. Earlier the
bail application of the petitioner was rejected *vide* order dated
31.07.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 29922 of 2024.

3. The petitioner seeks regular bail in a case registered
for the offence under Sections 386, 387 of the Indian Penal
Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

4. The following order was passed on 31.07.2024 in
Cr. Misc. No. 29922 of 2024 :-

Heard learned counsel for the
petitioners and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners seek bail in
connection with Pusa P.S. Case No. 114 of 2023,
registered for the offence under Sections 386, 387
of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms
Act.



3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioners are said to have demanded extortion from the informant and also fired upon the informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioners never demanded any extortion from the informant. The petitioner no. 1 has three criminal antecedents whereas petitioner no. 2 has two criminal antecedents and in all cases they are on bail. The petitioners are in custody since 03.11.2023.

5. Learned APP for the State vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioners for grant of bail by contending that they have demanded extortion and fired on the informant.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and the serious allegation levelled against the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the application of the petitioners for grant of regular bail is dismissed.

5. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that charges have been framed but no witness has been examined.

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner is accused of demanding extortion, I am not inclined to review my earlier order. Accordingly, this application for regular bail is hereby rejected.

7. The Superintendent of Police, Samastipur is directed to ensure the attendance of the witnesses in the trial.

8. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the



Superintendent of Police, Samastipur through FAX for its compliance forthwith.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Shishir/-

U			
---	--	--	--

