

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13050 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-179 Year-2024 Thana- Raghunathpur District- East Champaran

Ramanand Thakur S/O Sambhunath Thakur R/O Village- Murarpur, P.S-
Harsidhi, Distt.- East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhimanyu Deo

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Bilash Roy Raman

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 05-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Raghunathpur P.S. Case No. 179 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 61(2) and 3(5) of the BNS as well as Section 27 of the Arms Act.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody since 26.12.2024 and the informant alleges that Jhunnu Kumar Singh @ Mohit Singh called his son on 09.12.2024 at 10 A.M. on the pretext that his motorcycle is without fuel, thus asked his son to come near Umesh Pan Bhandar, accordingly, his son left on his motorcycle and reached at the shop of Sachin where



Mohit came and sat with his son on his motorcycle and left towards Gadariya but on the way Mohit shot him, accordingly he reached the place of occurrence and saw his son lying in firearm injury on head and hand and disclosed that Mohit shot him and also took name of other accused but his voice was not clear, further alleges that his son and Mohit were friend and business partner and Mohit owed money which his son was demanding, thus to misappropriate the money, the occurrence was committed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is not named in the FIR and during the course of investigation his name transpired but then specific allegation of firing is against Mohit.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner and submits that trial has commenced and seven prosecution witnesses have been examined. It is also submitted that during course of investigation, it transpired that petitioner was also present at the place of occurrence and has taken money from Mohit and after Mohit committed the occurrence of killing he fled along with the petitioner.



6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

