

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72771 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-222 Year-2024 Thana- NAWADA MUFFASIL District- Nawada

Manoj Singh @ Manoj Kumar Son of Late Chandrashekhar Singh Village-
Gonawa, P.S Nawada, District-Nawada

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Anand, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 25-02-2025 Heard Mr. N.K. Agrawal, learned Senior Counsel for
the petitioner and Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, learned APP.

2. The petitioner is in judicial custody in connection with Mufassil P.S. Nawada Case No. 222 of 2024 for the offence punishable under Sections 25(1-B) 26 and 35 of Arms Act lodged on 07.07.2024 by the informant, Vijay Kumar.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant alleged that in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 215 of 2024 and on the confessional statement that the weapons used in the murder has been provided by the accused, number of other accused were apprehended whereafter, it was revealed that the weapons have been provided by one Raushan Kumar. This led to FIR/arrest.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that so far as killing of Mamta Kumari which led to lodging of



Mufassil PS Case No. 215 of 2020 is concerned, he will face the consequences of the allegations made therein. In the present case, it is recovery of arms for which a separate case has been lodged and in that background, he being in custody since 07.07.2024, deserves bail.

5. Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, learned APP on the other hand opposes the prayer submitting that a perusal of order of the learned Sessions Judge would show that at the behest of Rajesh Kumar who is/was related to Mamta Kumari (deceased), as a contract killer, the petitioner acted. It is on his confession that the arms used in the said killing has been recovered/seized which led to the present case.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts, though it is a case of recovery of arms, the Court cannot overlook the fact that the same arm was used to kill an innocent lady at the behest of one Rajesh Kumar. In that background, this Court, for the present, is not inclined to extend him any relief, which is accordingly, rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

perwez

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

