

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78008 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-435 Year-2024 Thana- SAHPUR District- Patna

Ranjeet Kumar Son of Late Ajit Kumar @ Ajeet Kumar Resident of Draves Lane @ Drivers Lane, Near Masjid, P.O. and P.S.- Danapur, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pushpendra Priyedarshi, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Jharkhandi Upadhyay, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 09-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. This is the second attempt on behalf of the petitioner for grant of bail in connection with Shahpur P.S. Case No. 435 of 2024 registered for the offence under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 308(5), 351(2), 352, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 25(1-B)a, 26, 27 35 of the Arms Act.

3. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner has been rejected vide order dated 14.05.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 22717 of 2025, which reads as under:

“Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner, who is in custody since 27.12.2024, seeks regular bail in connection with Shahpur P.S. Case No. 435 of



2024 registered for the offence under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 308(5), 351(2), 352, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 25(1-B)a, 26, 27 35 of the Arms Act.the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant of the case had purchased a land in Danapur and was threatened by one Arshad Hussain for extortion of money of Rs.5 crore. On the date of occurrence, the informant and his friend after construction of the boundary wall were sitting on the plot when one Saddam Hussain along with others came there and started firing. When the police reached the place of occurrence, one criminal fled away and this petitioner along with others was caught on the spot.

4. From the petitioner, one loaded country made pistol has been recovered and from other criminals, pistols, etc., have been recovered.

5. The petitioner is in custody since 27.12.2024 and claims clean antecedent.

6. Considering the demand of extortion and the firing done by the petitioner and others, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this application for regular bail is hereby rejected. The trial is directed to be expedited.

8. The Senior Superintendent of Police, Patna will ensure the presence of the witnesses in the trial on all the dates so that these kinds of criminals do not roam freely in the society.

9. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patna through FAX for its compliance forthwith.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 27.1.2024 and since the charges have not been framed for want of sanction order under the Arms Act, he may be released on bail.



5. Considering the gravity of the offence and charges against the petitioner, I am not inclined to review my earlier order.

6. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

7. The District Magistrate, Patna is directed to take a decision on the sanction for prosecution, of the petitioner within one month from the date of receipt/ production of a copy of this order.

9. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the District Magistrate, Patna forthwith through FAX or e-mail for its compliance.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

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

