IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64314 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010903152026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-242 Year-2024 Thana- BIDUPUR District- Vaishali

==========

Rajeev Kumar @ Rajeev Kumar Ranjan @ Ranjan S/o Basudeo Rai @ Basudeo Ray R/o Village- Gopalpur Chaknai, P.S.- Bidupur, District- Vaishali

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manish Chandra Gandhi, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Murli Dhar, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

4 29-10-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Bidupur P.S. Case No. 242 of 2024, registered for an offence under Sections 364 and 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code and under Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution story, which has been lodged on the basis of written report submitted by the informant to the effect that on the date of occurrence, while the informant was going to his uncle’s house, in the meantime, the petitioner and co-accused Sushil Kumar met him. They were riding a motorcycle and told him to accompany him for having a feast. The informant accompanied them, however, on way, the

WEB COPY

informant became suspicious and he tried to alight from the vehicle. Both the accused persons threatened the informant with pistol and told him to accompany them. They took him forcefully on the bank of river Ganga at Gopalpur Chaknai at around 7:00-8:00 PM. They started firing at the informant and on account of the said firing, he sustained injuries and fell down, however, taking advantage, he fled from there and thereafter, with the help of local people, he informed the police station and from there he was referred to Bidupur Health Centre. From there, he was referred to Sadar Hospital at Hajipur for better treatment.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence. He submits that the informant sustained bullet injury on his left palm and another injury on the left side of his waist, however, the injury report is not present. He next submits that in absence of any injury report brought on record, the nature of alleged fire arm injuries and the weapons used cannot be ascertained. He submits that the informant has not disclosed any motive on the part of the petitioner and co-accused Sushil Kumar of committing the crime. He submits that none of the witnesses have supported the case, during course of

WEB COPY

investigation and the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 24.03.2026. Leaned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an accused in six other cases, apart from the present case, however, in three of the cases, he has not been named as an accused and in the remaining cases, the petitioner has already been enlarged on bail by the competent Courts.

5. *Per contra,* the learned A.P.P. appearing on behalf of the State, while opposing the prayer for bail of the petitioner submits that the petitioner and co-accused Sushil Kumar fired at the informant, due to which he sustained fire arm injuries and further, the petitioner is an accused in six other cases, therefore, he does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Having considered the rival submissions and after going through the records as well as the case-diary and the injury report appended thereto, it would transpire that the doctor, who treated the injured informant found three injuries on his body part. One entry wound on the back of left lumber region of the informant was found and one exit wound of the front of left lumber region was found. The doctor has further found the injuries to be caused by fire arm and to be grievous in nature. Further, during course of investigation the confessional statement of the co-accused Sushil Kumar was recorded, which

WEB COPY

is mentioned in the paragraph No. 31 of the case-diary, wherein, he disclosed his involvement in multiple cases, including the present case, along with the petitioner and he disclosed that he and the petitioner fired at the informant. The confessional statement of the petitioner has also been recorded in paragraph No. 63 of the case-diary, wherein, he also confessed his involvement in multiple cases, including the present case and stated that both he and co-accused Sushil Kumar took the informant near bank of river Ganga and fired at him, on account of some dispute with the informant, since he was not returning a weapon, which he had taken from one Kundan Kumar. Further, witnesses have also stated in their statement that they had seen the informant going on the motorcycle along with the petitioner and co-accused Sushil Kumar towards bank of river Ganga. Considering the materials available in the case-diary and the antecedent of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and the same is hereby rejected.

(Ritesh Kumar, J)

Anjali/-

U		T	

WEB COPY