

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72493 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-114 Year-2020 Thana- CHARPOKHARI District- Bhojpur

Ankit Kumar @ Ankit Kumar Singh S/o- Kamlesh Singh @ Kamlesh Kumar
Singh R/v- Pathar Ps- Charpokhari Dist- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shiv Prasad Gupta, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Gauri Shankar Gupta, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 15-10-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with S. Tr.
No. 168 of 2025, arising out of Charpokhari P.S. Case No. 114
of 2020 instituted for the offence under Sections 448, 504, 302
& 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on
04.07.2020 at about 7:00 a.m., the accused persons Kiran Devi,
Ankit Kumar (petitioner) and Kamlesh Kumar came to the
informant's house demanding repayment of a loan, and during
the altercation, Ankit Kumar (petitioner) assaulted the
informant's father with an iron rod, Kiran Devi sat on his chest,
and Kamlesh Kumar pressed his neck, causing his death.



4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 14.01.2025. Petitioner bears no criminal antecedent, as per disclosure made in paragraph No. 3 of the bail application.

5. It has been further submitted by the petitioner's counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Nothing has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. There is no independent witness to the occurrence. Charge sheet has already been submitted in this case. Other co-accused has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 27.08.2021, passed in Cr. Misc. No. 13016 of 2021.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. There is direct allegation against the petitioner of inflicting iron rod upon the deceased, hence, he does not deserve the privilege of bail.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and specifically taking into account the direct allegation the petitioner of inflicting iron rod blow upon the deceased, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer for bail is, accordingly, *rejected*.

8. The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as expeditiously as possible without any undue delay and



unnecessary adjournments.

9. However, petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail if the trial is not concluded within a period of five months from today.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

