

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS

JUDGE-IX, SAMASTIPUR

B.P NO-910/2023

Bibhutipur P.S. Case No-69/23

Ranjeet Kumar Jha @ W. Jha Vrs. The state of Bihar

24.08.2023

Heard the ld. A.P.P today on the bail petition filed on behalf of the under custody petitioner accused **Ranjeet Kumar Jha @ Dabloo Jha (misspelled as 'W' in the bail petition)** who is in custody since 06.06.2023 in connection with Bibhutipur P.S. Case no-69/2023, u/s-147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 302, 307, 504, 506 I.P.C. and Sec.27 Arms Act. The ld. Counsel for the petitioner accused has already been heard on the last date.

The ld. Counsel for the petitioner accused, Sri Gautam Bhardwaj, has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is not named in the F.I.R and he has been made accused in this case on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused persons. The ld. Counsel has further submitted that the petitioner has criminal antecedent but he is on bail. The ld. Counsel for the petitioner has orally submitted that in this case, two accused persons namely Rambalak Singh and Mahesh Kumar Raut have been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court, Patna and ld. Sessions Court, Samastipur respectively and so it has been prayed to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

The ld. A.P.P Sri Gauri Shankar Mishra has vehemently opposed the prayer of bail . The ld. A.P.P has submitted that the petitioner accused is a dreaded criminal and he had taken the *Supari* (contract) for killing the brother of the informant. The ld. A.P.P has further submitted that there is sufficient material in the

Continued

24.08.2023 case diary which shows the complicity/involvement of petitioner accused in the alleged occurrence. The ld. A.P.P has further submitted that the petitioner accused has criminal antecedent and as mentioned in para-10 of the bail petition, several cases are pending against him. There is also mention of criminal antecedent of the petitioner accused in the case diary. The ld. A.P.P has further submitted that the case of petitioner accused is on a different footing than that of the co-accused persons and the investigation is still pending against the petitioner accused. Therefore, the petitioner accused does not deserve bail.

Heard both the sides and perused the case record. From the perusal of case record, it appears that in this case the FIR has been lodged under sec. u/s-147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 302, 307, 504, 506 I.P.C. and sec.27 Arms Act against six named accused persons and 4-5 unknown persons. The petitioner accused is not named in the F.I.R. but during the course of investigation, his name has surfaced on the basis of disclosure/confessional statement given by the co-accused persons namely Rambalak Singh and Lalbabu Prasad. From perusal of disclosure/confessional statement of both the co-accused persons it appears that co-accused persons had met the petitioner accused at his house and had given him *supari*(contract) for the murder of the brother of the informant. This fact is further corroborated from perusal of para- 285 and 286 of the case diary, which contains the analysis of call detail records of both the co-accused persons. Thus, there is sufficient material available in the case diary which shows the complicity/involvement of the petitioner accused in the alleged occurrence. Admittedly, the

petitioner accused has criminal antecedent and several cases are pending against him which is also evident from the perusal of para-

Continued

24.08.2023 291 of the case diary wherein it is mentioned that five cases are pending against the petitioner accused under different police stations. Moreover, as per para-369 of the case diary the case has been found true against the petitioner and other co-accused persons and while chargesheet has been submitted against other co-accused persons, the investigation is still going on against the petitioner accused and other 2-3 unidentified persons.

Therefore, at this stage in the above said facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the bail petition filed on behalf of petitioner accused Ranjit Kumar Jha @ Dabloo Jha is hereby **rejected**.

Let a copy of this order along with the case diary be sent to the Id. Court below.

A.S.J-IX,
Samastipur.