

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39919 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-36 Year-2003 Thana- MUSRIGHRARI District- Samastipur

Baijnath Rawat @ Baijhnath Raut S/o Late Ram Jatan Raut R/o Village-
Rampur Keshopatti, Ward No.7, Bejhadih Rupauli, P.S.-Samastipur, District-
Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kumar Praveen, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rajendra Prasad Nat, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

4 03-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Mushrigharari P.S. Case No. 36 of 2003 instituted for the
offences under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code and
Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per prosecution case, three unknown culprits
armed with gun fired upon the informant and Raj Raushan, as a
result of which Raj Raushan sustained injuries and, later on,
died.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. Petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. The name of the petitioner transpired in this case on the basis of suspicion. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that general and omnibus allegation has been made against the petitioner. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 04.04.2025 and has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP further submitted that as per paragraph nos. 55 and 81, the witnesses have specifically stated that this petitioner committed the murder of the deceased and further, the post-mortem report also supports the prosecution case, therefore, the petitioner does not deserve to be released on bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, there being ample material against the petitioner in the case diary, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

8. Learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.



9. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew the prayer for grant of bail before the Trial Court if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from today.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

