

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.54239 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-157 Year-2024 Thana- BIHPUR District- Bhagalpur

Md. Soji @ Md. Souzim S/o Md. Isro @ Md. Israfil R/o Village- Balaha, P.S.-
Bhawanipur, District- Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ranjan Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Pawan Kumar Chaurasia, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER**

2 12-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Bihpur
P.S. Case No-157 of 2024, registered for the offences punishable
under Sections 147, 149, 341, 323, 325 and 307 of the Indian
Penal Code but later on Section 302 of the IPC was added.

3. As per allegation, the Petitioner and ten other co-
accused have assaulted the husband of the Informant, causing
serious injury to him, which resulted into his death in the course
of treatment.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this
case. He further submits that the allegation against all the
accused persons including the Petitioner is general and omnibus



in nature and there is no specific allegation against the Petitioner. He further submits that the co-accused Samsid, Md. Mojim, Bugo Alee and Md. Noushad have already been enlarged on regular bail by co-ordinate Benches of this Court by the order dated 01.05.2025, 08.05.2025 and 04.07.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. Nos. 23709 of 2025, 65990 of 2025, 41737 of 2025 and 42504 of 2025, respectively.

5. He further submits that the petitioner has been languishing in jail since 07.07.2025.

6. It has also been stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail petition that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

7. It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the bail petition that the petitioner has not moved this Court earlier either for anticipatory bail or regular one.

8. However, learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer of the petitioner for bail submitting that the case of the Petitioner is distinguished from those of the co-accused because the Petitioner is in custody just since 07.07.2025, i.e only for about one month, whereas the co-accused were in custody for several months. He further submits that as per the order of the District Court, there is sufficient material in the case diary showing that the Petitioner was



present at the time of the occurrence and had participated in the alleged occurrence.

9. Considering the material on record and period of custody, I am not persuaded to enlarge the Petitioner on bail at this stage.

10. The present petition is **rejected**, accordingly.

(Jitendra Kumar, J.)

Chandan/-

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

