

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.50578 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-153 Year-2024 Thana- ARA NAWADA District- Bhojpur

=====

Randhir Mahto @ Sanjeet Kumar S/O Sita Ram Mahto @ Singh Permanent
Add.- Village- Bankat, P.S- Jagdishpur, Dist.- Bhojpur, At Present R/O
Anaith, Ara, P.S.- Nawada, Dist.- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anand Kumar Singh, Advocate Mr. Rahul Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Jharkhandi Upadhyay, APP
For the O.P.	:	Mr. Madhu Prasad, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 01-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. This is the second attempt on behalf of the
petitioner for grant of bail in connection with Ara Nawada P.S.
Case No.153 of 2024 registered for the offence punishable
under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code and under
section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner has
been rejected vide order dated 18.01.2025 passed in Cr. Misc.
No. 1034 of 2025, which reads as follows:

*“ Heard Mr. P.N. Shahi, learned
Senior Counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.*

2. This application for grant of



regular bail arises out of Ara Nawada P.S. Case No.153 of 2024 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code and under section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the F.I.R., the petitioner is the assailant of the deceased.

4. Mr. P.N. Shahi, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that though the inquest panchnama was made on the date of occurrence in the night but the F.I.R. has been registered on the next date at about 2:30 P.M. by the wife of the deceased. He further submits that the persons who have signed the inquest report are also the witnesses and nothing prevented them from lodging the F.I.R. on the date of occurrence. The petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case because of land dispute.

5. Learned counsel for the informant has submitted that the informant, who is the wife of the deceased, was in shock and therefore, she did not register the F.I.R. on the date of occurrence.

6. The arguments of learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner cannot be examined at this stage. These arguments can be raised in the trial by the defence.

7. Considering the fact that this is a case of murder in which the petitioner is the assailant of the deceased, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of regular bail.

8. Accordingly, this bail application is dismissed. The trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same as early as possible.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner very fairly submits that five witnesses out of nine witnesses have already been examined.

5. Considering the fact that the petitioner is the



assailant of the deceased, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

7. The Court below is directed to conclude the trial at the earliest.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

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

