

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6515 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-334 Year-2025 Thana- NARPATGANJ District- Araria

Chhotu Sharma @ Mithlesh Kumar Sharma Son of Late Dhanraj Sharma R/o
Village - Pathraha, Ward No. 06, P.S. - Narpatganj, District - Araria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dheeraj Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Choubey Jawahar, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 04-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Narpatganj P.S. Case No. 334 of 2025 instituted for the offence
under Sections 109, 303(2), 324(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita, 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that on
10.07.2025, the informant's son Shailendra Kumar was lured by
his friends on the pretext of repairing his damaged mobile and
taken towards Chanda School, where accused Chhotu Sharma
(petitioner) allegedly fired at him causing injury on his thigh.

4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner
that the petitioner is in custody since 07.09.2025. 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. There is delay of two months in lodging the FIR. Informant is not the eye witness. From perusal of the injury report, two injuries have been found on the right leg of the son of the informant. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. It is lastly submitted that victim has sustained only one injury, hence, there was no intention to kill.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, there being direct allegation of firing against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, at this stage. Prayer for bail is hereby *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



three months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of
this order.

Raj Kishore/-

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

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

