

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6516 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-76 Year-2023 Thana- NADI P.S. District- Patna

1. Sanjiv Rai @ Sanjiv Kumar @ Sanjeev Kumar @ Sanjeev Rai Son of Late Randevan Rai @ late Ram Devan singh @ Ramdeo Rai Resident of Village- Jethuli, PS- Nadi, District - Patna
2. Prabhu Rai @ Prabhu Dayal Singh Son of Late Randevan Rai @ late Ram Devan singh @ Ramdeo Rai Resident of Village- Jethuli, PS- Nadi, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Suraj Kumar, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
CAV ORDER

6 21-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners have prayed for bail in connection with Nadi P.S. Case No. 76 of 2023 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 342, 448, 302, 307, 506 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the nephew of the informant namely, Bittu Kumar was going towards the road from his house on his four-wheeler. The road was blocked by the henchmen of Ramesh Rai with sand and concrete. The nephew of the informant requested Ramesh Rai and Satish Kumar @ Baccha Rai to clear the way on this, Baccha Rai, along with his family member got infuriated and at the instance of Umesh Rai



and his associates total of 30 in number and 15-20 unnamed persons, armed with rifles and pistols, started firing. The petitioners are also named and started firing with arms. The nephew of the informant started fleeing away from there. On this, all the accused persons went to the house of the informant. Umesh Rai, Baccha Rai, Satendra Rai, Rampravesh Rai and his family members started firing at the family members of the informant. Raushan Kumar, Nagendra Rai, Jagendra Rai, Jugehswar Rai, Munarik Rai, Chanarik Rai, and Rajendra Rai received gunshot injuries and from the gunshot injuries, Gautam and Raushan died on 19.02.2023, Munarik Rai died on 20.02.2023, and Nagendra Rai and Chanarik Rai were in PMCH. It is reported that Chanarik Rai also died during the course of treatment.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the nature of the allegation is general and omnibus and there is no specific allegation against the petitioners. It has also been submitted that similarly situated co-accused persons, namely, Bhola Kumar, Rajeev Kumar, Dilip Roy, Baiju Rai, Bijay Kumar, and Rahul Kumar, have been granted bail by the learned Co-ordinate Benches of this Court. It has further been submitted that for the same occurrence, in fact, three FIRs were lodged explaining the same. It is pointed out that the first FIR was



lodged as Nadi P.S. Case No. 74 of 2023, which was lodged by the police In-charge of Nadi Police Station. Subsequently, another FIR of the same occurrence was lodged as Nadi P.S. Case No. 75 of 2023. The present and third case regarding the same occurrence was lodged by the informant making a statement before the police in the emergency ward of PMCH, Patna, where his father was admitted and died subsequently. He further submits that petitioner no. 1 is languishing in judicial custody since 21.05.2025 whereas petitioner no. 2 is in custody since 30.04.2025.

5. Learned counsel for the informant and Mr. Pranav Kumar, learned APP for the State have vehemently opposed the bail of the petitioners and have stated that the bail petition of Umesh Rai and Aryan Kumar have been refused by the learned Coordinate Benches of this Court and have also filed an advertisement which goes to show that on these petitioners a reward of Rs. 50,000/- was declared by police as they were absconding. It has further been submitted that during the course of investigation, it has also come out that both petitioners were seen in the place of occurrence with arms, which is apparent from Paragraphs 76, 77, and 78 of the case diary and also the statements recorded by SIT in Paragraphs 167, 168, 169, and 170.



6. Though it is a case of indiscriminate firing, altogether four persons have succumbed to the injuries, and many others have received firearm injuries, and these two petitioners were seen by the witnesses at the place of occurrence being armed with weapons and the advertisement which has been filed by the side of the informant also goes to show that they were absconding, and that is why the advertisement in the paper has to be published, and a reward of Rs. 50,000/- was also announced.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the above facts and circumstances of the case, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail at this stage, however, they may renew their prayer for bail after six months if the trial is not concluded.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for application of regular bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	09.04.2026
Uploading Date	21.04.2026
Transmission Date	21.04.2026

