

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1755 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-183 Year-2025 Thana- SINDHIYA District- Samastipur

Ravin Singh, S/o Umesh Prasad Singh, Resident of Village- Lagma, P.S.-
Singhiya, District- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Vijay Anand, Advocate
For the State	:	Dr. Mrityunjaya Kr.Gautam, APP
For the informant	:	Mr. Gunjesh Gautam, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KHATIM REZA
ORAL ORDER

4 23-02-2026 Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner,

learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the

informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Singhiya P.S. Case No. 183 of 2025 dated 06.10.2025 instituted
for the offence punishable under Sections 109, 352, 3(5) of the
Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 & Section 27/30 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the soil was floating in
the rain and gone towards the house of elder uncle of the
informant due to which his uncle Umesh Prasad Singh came and
started abusing his father. In the meantime, his *Manjhla* uncle,
Mahesh Prasad Singh came and forbidden to him. Then, another
son of Umesh Prasad Singh, namely, Ravin Singh (petitioner)



armed with pistol, came from his house and started firing indiscriminately. It is further alleged that the uncle of the informant, Umesh Prasad Singh also started indiscriminate firing from his pistol. As a result, father of the informant, namely, Suresh Singh and another uncle Mahesh Prasad Singh sustained 4-5 bullet injuries and they fell down. It is further alleged that when his mother Ranjana Devi came for rescue them, both of them started firing upon her. The mother sustained two bullet injuries on her thigh. On the sound of fire, when the informant came outside, then Ram Kala Devi (Aunt) and Arpana Devi (*Bhabhi*) came with cartridges to reload on their pistols. The informant after seeing the condition of his father and uncle, tried to run away, but both of them started indiscriminate firing upon him, as a result, he received six firearms injuries. The informant sustained 4 injuries on his thigh and one injury in left hand and one bullet injury in his abdomen. On the sound of firing, nearby people gathered there, as a result, they were fled away and the informant and other were brought to the hospital for treatment.

4. Mr. N. K. Agrawal, learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case. Learned senior counsel for the



petitioner further submits that both the parties are close agnates. From bare perusal of F.I.R., it is evident that the informant is not an eye-witness to the occurrence. It is further submitted that as per the allegation, as levelled in the F.I.R., the occurrence was in two parts and the informant is not the eye-witness of the first part, which is evident from the statement of the informant in the *fard beyan*. The present case is the counter blast of Singhiya P.S. Case No. 184 of 2025 which was lodged by the wife of the petitioner. The informant's father and the petitioner's father are full brother. There is land dispute between the parties. The occurrence took place due to rain water which was floating through the house of the petitioner. The trouble started in both the family when the elder uncle of the petitioner, namely, Suresh Prasad Singh, the father of the informant, unloaded two tractor soil for levelling the front of the house and because of that there was water logging in front of the house of the petitioner's family. The petitioner dugged some portion of the land of the uncle to pass out the logged water and because of that, the informant's side came armed with various weapon and started assaulting, and for in private defence and to save his life, the petitioner started firing from his licensed arms. The petitioner had fired only to save his life as well as lives of the family



members. The petitioner is an Army personnel and he visited his native village on leave on 13.09.2025. Learned senior counsel further submitted that during investigation, the informant, namely, Gulshan Kumar submitted a Pendrive to the Investigating Officer which contradicts the prosecution case. The aforesaid facts has been recorded in paragraph no. 51 of the supplementary case diary. Lastly, it has been submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 07.10.2025 having no criminal antecedents. Charge-sheet has been submitted in the case.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submitted that four injured persons have sustained firearm injury on different parts of the body including the abdomen, legs and the petitioner fired indiscriminately upon the informant, his father, uncle and mother. During investigation, the injured persons, who are eye-witness to the occurrence, specifically stated in paragraph nos. 16, 17, 38 & 62 that the petitioner fired indiscriminately upon them, as a result, they sustained bullet injuries on different parts of the body. The injury reports also support the case of the prosecution and the allegation of indiscriminate firing against the petitioner due to which four persons were badly injured.



6. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and specific allegation against the petitioner that he fired from his licensed pistol causing injury to four persons and the prosecution case was also supported by the injured persons, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for regular bail on behalf of the petitioner stands rejected.

8. The learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial and take all endeavour to conclude the trial at the earliest, preferably, within a period of nine months from the date of receipt or production of a copy of this order.

9. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew the prayer for bail after nine months if the trial is not concluded within the stipulated time.

(Khatim Reza, J)

premchand/-

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

