

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32736 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-90 Year-2025 Thana- MUFFASIL District- West Champaran

Rahul Pandey@Rahul Kumar Pandey@Aditya Pandey@Aditya Kumar
Pandey@Ramu Pandey@Ramu Kumar Pandey Son of Satyendra Pandey
Resident of Village-Khairatiya, Ward No. 13, P.S- Manuapul, District-West
Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ram Adya Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dr. Ajeet Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 06-08-2025 Heard Mr. Ram Adya Singh, learned counsel for the
petitioner and Mr. Dr. Ajeet Kumar, learned APP for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Bettiah Muffasil P.S. Case No. 90/ 2025 dated 15.02.2025
registered for the offence(s) punishable under Section 318(4),
352, 109(1) and 3(5) of the BNS and section 27 of the Arms
Act.

3. As per the prosecution's story, this petitioner on the
order of co-accused, Satyendra Pandey fired upon the informant
with gun which hit on his right rib and he fell down on the
ground after becoming injured. It is further alleged that the
petitioner also fired upon Baban Singh, owner of the informant,
which did not hit him.



4. The main submissions advanced by the petitioner's counsel are that as per the allegation, this petitioner fired at the informant and caused him firearm injury but as per the injury report he sustained simple injury and there is no allegation of repeated firing by this petitioner at the injured which shows that he had no intention to kill him. It is further submitted that petitioner has been languishing in jail since 19.02.2025 and against him investigation has been completed.

5. The learned APP appearing for the State has opposed the bail prayer of the petitioner.

6. Heard both the sides and perused the FIR and case diary. As per the allegation, accused, Satyendra Pandey with whom the informant's owner had a commercial transaction for purchasing a Scorpio vehicle asked this petitioner to open fire at the informant and his owner and then this petitioner fired causing firearm injury to the informant on vital part of his body. On the body of the informant, wound of entry and wound of exit has been found. Considering the seriousness of the allegation, this court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the same stands rejected.

7. The petitioner may renew his bail prayer after examination of the injured in the trial, if the trial court has



proceeded with the trial in respect of the petitioner.

(Shailendra Singh, J)

BKS/-

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

