

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68103 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-348 Year-2024 Thana- NAUBATPUR District- Patna

Dharmendra Sharma, Son of Late Madan Sharma, R/O Village - Samanpura,
P.S.- Naubatpur, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ansul, Sr. Adv. Mr. Shyam Kishore, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Anil Kumar, Adv.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Sumit Kumar, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 07-11-2025 Heard Mr. Ansul, learned Senior Advocate for the petitioner, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State. The informant is represent through Mr. Sumit Kumar, learned Advocate.

2. This is the second attempt made on behalf of the petitioner for grant of bail in connection with Naubatpur P.S. Case No.348 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 302, 504, 120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Earlier, the prayer for bail of the petitioner was turned down by this Court vide order dated 28.02.2025 in Cr. Misc. No.9553 of 2025, taking into consideration the specific nature of accusation of causing firearm injury, leading to the



death of the son of the informant, apart from indulged in threatening.

4. Learned Senior Advocate for the petitioner contended that though the prayer for bail of the petitioner was rejected on merit(s); however, this fact cannot be ignored that the presence of the informant with his wife appeared to be doubtful. It has also not been disclosed that as to how and on which part, this petitioner had fired upon the deceased. It is also contended that enmity is a sword which cuts both the sides and false implication of the petitioner cannot be ruled out. Moreover, the petitioner has been incarcerated since 12.09.2024 and till date even the charge(s) has not been framed.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State and the learned Advocate for the informant vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that because of the conduct of the accused persons, the charges could not be framed; however, except one accused person, all of them have secured their appearance and there is every likelihood that the charges would be framed on the next date. The contention of the State and the informant also stand supported by the report of jurisdictional court.

6. Having considered the submissions advanced by



the learned Advocate for the respective parties and taking note of the materials available on record, especially the specific nature of accusation, this Court is not acceded to the prayer for bail of the petitioner. Accordingly, his prayer is rejected.

7. It is expected that the learned jurisdictional/trial court shall take all sincere efforts to expedite the trial and conclude the same as early as possible.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

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

