

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33262 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-15 Year-2025 Thana- CHARPOKHARI District- Bhojpur

Arbind Rai @ Bilai Rai @ Bilai Ram S/o Late Chandrama Ray Resident of
Village- Koyal Police Station- Charpokhari District- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anil Kumar Singh, Adv. Mr. Akash Kumar Mishra, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Nirmala Kumari, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Amish Kumar 1, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 19-06-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. This is the 2nd attempt of the petitioner seeking bail in connection with S.Tr. No. 281 of 2025 arising out of Charpokhari P.S. Case No. 15 of 2025 registered for the offence under Sections 109 & 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023 read with Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Earlier, the bail application of the petitioner was rejected on 11.09.2025 in Cr. Misc. No. 38368 of 2025 which reads as follows:-

“Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Charpokhari P.S. Case No. 15 of 2025 registered for the offence under Sections 109, 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 and under Section 27 of the Arms Act.



3. *As per the prosecution case, the petitioner has shot at the victim which hit him in his chest.*

4. *The petitioner is in jail since 29.01.2025.*

5. *Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case as the victim and the petitioner are agnates.*

6. *Considering the direct allegations levelled against the petitioner of fired at the victim, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.*

7. *Accordingly, this application is dismissed for the present.”*

4. In the trial, only two witnesses have been examined and there is delay in trial.

5. Learned counsel for the informant submitted that it is the accused persons, who are delaying the trial and they are not cross-examining the witnesses for which appropriate cost has been imposed upon them by the Trial Judge.

6. Considering the gravity of the offence and the fact that the trial is being delayed by the petitioner, I am not inclined to review my earlier order.

7. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

8. As the informant is bringing witnesses, it is the petitioner and his lawyers, who are duty bound to cooperate in the trial.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

sadique/-

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

