

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.73487 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-94 Year-2024 Thana- Manikpur District- Lakhisarai

=====

Rohit Kumar @ Raj Rishu @ Raj Rishi S/O Brahmdeo Mahto @ Brahamdeo
Mahto R/O Village- Manikpur, P.S.- Manikpur, District- Lakhisarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Anand, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Satyendra Prasad, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

4 11-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The earlier application for grant of bail on behalf of the petitioner was rejected by an order dated 23.04.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 89469 of 2024 (Annexure-P/1) and the prayer has been renewed upon change of stage.

3. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 103 (1), 351 (2) and 3 (5) of B.N.S.

4. As per the prosecution case, petitioner and others are alleged to have killed the son of the informant.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no eye witness to the present case and the informant is also not an eye witness of the alleged offence. It is further



submitted that there is a land dispute between the parties and there is no other tangible material to suggest the complicity of the petitioner but for tower location which has been found near the place of occurrence. It is only on account of suspicion that the petitioner has been made an accused in this case as he had earlier threatened the son of the deceased. It has also been submitted that since the petitioner belongs to the same village his tower location being found at the place of occurrence should not be leading to any suspicion. Further, the petitioner has been languishing in custody since 29.08.2024 and bears no criminal antecedent. Charges have been framed on 24.04.2025 and out of six witnesses named in the charge sheet only one prosecution witness has been examined and as such there is no likelihood of conclusion of trial in the near future.

6. Learned APP for the State opposed the bail petition.

7. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the case resting on suspicion, the above named petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Session Trial No.



92 of 2025 arising out of Manikpur P.S. Case No. 94 of 2024,
subject to the conditions that :

(i) One of the bailors will be his close relative/family
members.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present in
court on each and every date during trial and in the event of
failure on two consecutive dates without sufficient reasons, his
bail bonds shall be liable to be cancelled by the learned court
concerned.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

vashudha/-

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

