

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.21154 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-867 Year-2021 Thana- FATUA District- Patna

=====

Randhir Kumar S/o Late Subhash Prasad R/O vill- Mirzapur Nohta, PS-
Fatuha, Dist- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Atul Dayal
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Ms. Sucheta Yadav
For the Informant	:	Mr. Sunil Kumar Pathak

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 16-07-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the

learned APP for the State, and the learned counsel for the

informant.

2. This is the 2nd attempt of the petitioner seeking bail
in connection with Fatuha P.S. Case No. 867 of 2021 registered
for the offence under Sections 384 and 302 read with Section 34
of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner was
rejected on 29.07.2025 in Cr. Misc. No. 21886 of 2025 which
reads as follows:-

*Heard learned counsel for the petitioner
and learned counsel for the Informant as well as
learned A.P.P for the State.*

*2. The petitioner has preferred this
application for grant of regular bail in connection
with Fatuha P.S. Case No. 867 of 2021 dated*



08.11.2021 registered for the offences punishable u/ss 384 and 302 read with section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the co-accused Sanjay Kumar @ Bhoma demanded Rs. 20 lakhs from the informant's husband as Rangdari. It is further alleged that the petitioner and the co-accused persons along with three to four unknown miscreants surrounded the informant's husband and started firing. When the informant's husband tried to escape, in themeantime, all the accused persons caught hold of him and Sanjay Kumar fired on his head, Randhir Kumar (petitioner) fired on Panjara and Anjay Kumar fired on back and fled away from there.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. There is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. It is further alleged that from perusal of the inquest report, it is very much apparent that the son of the deceased was present at the place of occurrence at about 6.45 A.M. The police reached at place of occurrence but he has failed to lodge the written report/Fardbeyan before the police. It is further submitted that much prior to the lodging of the FIR i.e. 9.15 A.M the investigation has been started and the seizure list has been prepared. First seizure list was prepared at about 7.10 A.M. 2nd Seizure list was prepared at 7.25 A.M, 3rd seizure list was prepared at 7.40 A.M, 4th seizure list was prepared at 7.50 A.M. That it is submitted that from perusal of the seizure list it appears that it was prepared at 7.10 AM to 7.50 AM dated 8.11.2021 but the FIR was lodged at about 9.15 AM dated 8.11.2021. The first column of the seizure list showing case number which creates serious doubt about the prosecution case. The petitioner has four criminal antecedents as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The petitioner is in custody since 11.11.2024.

5. Learned counsel for the Informant as well as learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the bail petition of the petitioner by



submitting that there is specific allegation against the petitioner of firing on the informant's husband in his Panjara. It is further stated that as per the postmortem report, three entry wounds and three exit wounds were found and the cause of the death is fire arms injuries.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the heinous nature of allegation against the petitioner, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the application stands rejected.

7. The trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same at the earliest.

4. The petitioner is the assailant of the deceased. The deceased has been killed for demand of *Rangdari* of Rs. 20 Lakh. The petitioner is in custody since 11.11.2024 and has six criminal antecedents. In the trial, 3/4 out of 7 witnesses have already been examined.

5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, his criminal antecedents and the stage of the trial, I am not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the application for regular bail stands dismissed.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Shishir/-

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

