

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53107 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-430 Year-2024 Thana- ALAMNAGAR District- Madhepura

Sanjeev Kumar Mehata @ Sanjeev Kumar S/o- Avadhesh Mehata @
Awadhesh Mehta @ Avdhesh Sharma R/o Village- Bhagipur P.S-Alam Nagar
District-Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Pawan Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Pushpa Sinha.1, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

5 20-01-2026 Heard the learned Senior counsel for the petitioner
as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is seeking regular bail in connection
with Alamnagar P.S. Case No. 430 of 2024, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of the BNS and
Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The prosecution alleges that on 01.11.2024 at about
11:30 PM, the petitioner, Sanjeev Kumar Mehta, along with
other accused persons, forcibly entered the house of the
informant and fired with a country-made pistol at her husband.
It is further alleged that co-accused persons also fired, resulting
in the death of the informant's husband.

4. *Mr. N.K. Agrawal*, the learned Senior Counsel for



the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. There was no dispute between the deceased and the petitioner, rather the dispute was between the deceased and co-accused Mukesh Kumar Mehta, as transpires from paragraph no. 40 of the case diary. He has further submitted that the petitioner has been in custody for nearly a year and the charges have recently been framed.

5. The FIR itself shows that the petitioner fired at the deceased, hitting him below the right side of the chest and the second shot was fired by co-accused Mukesh Kumar Mehta, at the deceased. The wife of the deceased is an eyewitness and she has named the petitioner.

6. In my view, the petitioner does not deserve the privileges of bail, which is hereby *rejected*.

7. Considering the fact that the petitioner has been in custody for nearly a year, the learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Nirmal/-

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

