

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.91282 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-930 Year-2022 Thana- ARA NAWADA District- Bhojpur

Shubham Chaudhary @ Shubham Kumar Son of Vijay Shankar Choudhary
Resident of Village- Parashiya, P.S.- Jagdishpur, District- Bhojpur
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 01-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Rabindra Kumar.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 341, 342, 323, 504, 307, 379
and 34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 27 of the Arms
Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of two cases and is in custody since
02.10.2025. It is next submitted that the informant alleges that he
on call of Vinayak went to *Bazar Samiti* on 21.10.2022 at 7 A.M.
where three named accused persons namely Ritesh, Yash and
Kanhaiya came and started abusing and assaulting the informant,
on account of dispute, further when Ajit came to save the
informant, the three named accused started firing causing firearm
injury on Ajit's leg.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant specifically alleges that it were Ritesh, Yash and Kanhaiya who fired causing firearm injury to Ajit. It is next submitted that petitioner is not named in the FIR, but then his name transpired during the course of investigation based on the restatement of informant and statement of Ajit wherein they disclosed that it was this petitioner who fired causing firearm injury to Ajit. It is next submitted that from restatement of informant and statement of Ajit, it manifests that both were knowing the petitioner, but still petitioner was not named in the FIR which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution. It is also submitted that petitioner is a Mechanical Engineer and was working with Anjali Construction, an associate of JSW Steel, but then petitioner even lost his job because of his false implication in the instant case.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner, but then is not in a position to rebut the submissions of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner is not named in the FIR, but then it is submitted that if privilege of regular bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that if privilege of regular bail is



granted, the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the trial to prove his innocence.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Ara Nawada P.S. Case No. 930 of 2022.

7. One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his father namely Vijay Shankar Choudhary.

8. It is made clear that if the learned Trial Court comes to a conclusion that petitioner, after his release, is trying to delay the framing of charge or after framing of charge is trying to delay the trial, in both the conditions, the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the instant regular bail application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

