

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10285 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-161 Year-2025 Thana- RAMPUR HARI District- Muzaffarpur

Ramesh Sahani S/O Vijay Sahani R/O Vill.- Koili, Ward No. 4, P.S.-
Rampurhari, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mrs. Nachiketa Jha, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 07-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP
for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner has prayed for regular bail in connection with Rampurhari P.S. Case No. 161 of 2025 instituted for the offence under Sections 117(2), 103(1) and 3(5) of BNS.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the informant came to know that the petitioner along with two others is assaulting the husband of the informant at Litchi orchard by tying him with a tree. When she went there, she found that all the accused persons were assaulting her husband. She made request not to assault her husband despite that, he was being brutally assaulted due to which, he got unconscious and died.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner is innocent and committed no offence. Learned counsel has submitted that from perusal of the FIR, it is clear that the informant is not the eye witness of this case. He has submitted that from perusal of the para-14 of the case diary, it will transpire that Mukhiya Ram Deni Rai has informed FSL team and FSL team has found this death to be suspicious. From perusal of the restatement of the informant, it will transpire that her husband was being assaulted by the petitioner and others and other witnesses have stated that they have come to know about the occurrence from the informant. From perusal of the postmortem report, it will transpire that the doctor has not given any opinion regarding the cause of death and the viscera has been preserved. Moreover, a statement has been made in para-3 of this petition that the petitioner has got no criminal antecedent and he is languishing in judicial custody since 23.08.2025.

5. Learned APP appearing for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer of regular bail. Learned counsel has further submitted that the informant is the eye witness and she has seen the occurrence from her own eyes and from perusal of the postmortem report, it is clear that altogether eight injuries were found on the person of the deceased. He has also submitted that the petitioner is the



main assailant and police has not found evidence against two others and regarding them, supplementary investigation is under progress.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of this case as stated above, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage and, as such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.

7. However, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after six months if the trial is not concluded.

8. Learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same within the period as stated above.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Shubham/-

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

