

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74008 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-80 Year-2024 Thana- NADI P.S. District- Patna

=====

Dheeraj Kumar @ Deeraj Kumar Son of Gopal Rai @ Gopal Prasad Resident
of village - Jethuli, P.S.- Nadi @ Nadi Fatuha, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Durgesh Nandan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shahabuddin Azeem @ S. Azeem, A.P.P.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 03-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Nadi
P.S. Case No. 80 of 2024 instituted for the offence under
Sections 147, 148, 149, 302, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code
and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Prosecution case in short is that accused persons
have fired upon the brother of informant leading to his death.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the
petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case.
Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that general and
omnibus allegation has been made against the petitioner.
Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that other co-
accused has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated



27.06.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 39577 of 2025. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 05.04.2024 and has five criminal antecedents.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. There is specific allegation of firing against the petitioner.

6. In compliance of order dated 17.10.2025, a report dated 31.10.2025 has been received. From perusal of the report it appears that the case is fixed for hearing on discharge petition. The discharge petition of co-accused Sanjay Kumar @ Sanjeev Kumar was rejected vide order dated 22.07.2025. On 18.09.2025 a discharge petition was filed on behalf of accused Rahul Kumar, which is pending for hearing. It is further reported that trial would be concluded within three months.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of offences and also taking into consideration the criminal antecedent of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

9. Learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.

10. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to



renew the prayer for grant of bail before the Trial Court if the trial is not concluded within a period of three months from today. If any such application is filed before the learned court below, the court concerned shall consider the same on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

