

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78208 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-751 Year-2024 Thana- DANAPUR District- Patna

Vishal Kumar Jha @ Vishal Jha @ Raja S/o Late Nand Kishore Jha R/o
Village- Manikchowk, P.S.- Runnisaidpur, District- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vikash Kumar Jha, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shantanu Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

4 23-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. A prayer for bail has been made on behalf of the petitioner in connection with Danapur P.S. Case no.751 of 2024 registered under sections 103, 111(2), 61(2) and 3(5) of BNS and Section 27 of Arms Act.

3. Allegation in the F.I.R is that unknown miscreants are alleged to have shot dead the informant's son.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although FIR was lodged against unknown miscreants, the name of the petitioner subsequently transpired during course of investigation, based upon CCTV footage, which has been discussed in paragraph no.5 of the case diary, wherein the petitioner is said to have been identified along with two unknown persons. However, from paragraph number 22 and 23



of the case diary, which contains the statement of brother of the deceased, it would be apparent that the persons who were identified in the CCTV footage are three different persons, namely Kanhai Singh, Mukul Mishra and Karan Jha and not the petitioner, rather the petitioner has been stated to be involved in the case, but there is no case of him being identified in the CCTV footage. It is further submitted that the deceased himself was a man of several criminal antecedents and the FIR was lodged after two days of the occurrence. So far as the criminal antecedents of the petitioner is concerned, as a matter of fact, the petitioner was remanded in four other cases after his implication in the FIR being Purnahiya P.S. Case no. 8 of 2025, which subsequently led to an acquittal. The petitioner is in custody since 30.05.2025 and till date charges have not been framed.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State.

6. Taking into consideration the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that the implication of the petitioner is based upon suspicion and confessional statement and he has not even been identified in the CCTV footage, coupled with the fact that there is no



likelihood of the trial concluding in the near future, the petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail in connection with Danapur P.S. Case no.751 of 2024 on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court concerned where the case is pending/successor Court, subject to following conditions:-

(I) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be the family member/close relative of the petitioner.

(II) The petitioner shall remain physically present in the learned trial Court on each date and shall cooperate in the trial. In case the petitioner is absent on the two consecutive dates without sufficient reasons, the learned trial Court would be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

Harsh/-

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

