

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20476 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-344 Year-2020 Thana- SONEPUR District- Saran

=====

Pappu Singh @ Pappu Raj S/o Mr. Jaleshwar Singh R/o Vill- Baijalpur, P.S.-
Sonepur, Distt- Saran, Chapra

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kr Singh No.1, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Lalan Kumar, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 08-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Sonepur P.S. Case No. 344 of 2020, S. Tr. No. 324 of 2024
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148,
149, 342, 324, 307 and 302 of the IPC.

3. As per prosecution case, petitioner is said to
have assaulted the informant's uncle by means of sharp cut
weapon (Gadasi) as a result of which he sustained injury on
neck and he died on the spot. It is alleged that informant and
Deepak Kumar also sustained injury.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
bail prayer of the petitioner has already been rejected twice on
merit by this Court i.e. vide order dated 11.01.2024 passed in Cr.



Misc. No.66604/2023 and vide order dated 14.02.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 89318 of 2024. He further submits that petitioner is in custody since 21.05.2023 and bears no criminal antecedent. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the inquest report has been made earlier than that of lodging FIR and the investigation indicates that the whole story has been prepared in a pre-planned manner. Petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence as alleged in the FIR. Learned counsel further submits that nature of investigation indicates that the prosecution story is doubtful. He further submits that the delay of trial is not attributable to the petitioner as he is in custody since 21.05.2023.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that prayer for bail of the petitioner has already been rejected twice on merit by this Court and *the trial court report indicates that trial is almost on the verge of the completion as only three witnesses are yet to examined*. He further submits that in para 9 as well as para 33 of the case diary the informant Prince Kumar, who sustained injury severely and Deepak Kumar, who also sustained injury grievously have stated that there is direct allegation against the petitioner who is said to have assaulted by



means of sharp cutting weapon upon the neck of informant's uncle as a result of which he died on the spot and postmortem report also supported the story of prosecution. He further submits that there is no fresh ground to consider the prayer for bail of the petitioner. Hence, petitioner does not deserve bail.

6. In pursuance of the direction of this court, the learned trial court has sent its report vide letter no. 79 dated 04.05.2026 which reflects that only three witnesses are yet to be examined.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation levelled against the petitioner coupled with postmortem report, prayer for bail of the petitioner has already been rejected twice on merit as well as material available on record, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

8. However, the learned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as early as as possible.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

alok/-

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

