

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.54853 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-92 Year-2022 Thana- JADIA District- Supaul

=====

BABLU KUMAR S/o Bijendra Sah R/o Lalpur, Ward No.01, P.S.-
Singheshwar, District- Madhepura, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prabhakar Nath Rai, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anant Kumar 1, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 27-02-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned counsel for the informant as well as learned A.P.P. for

the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for

the offence under Sections 302, 201, 120(B) and 34 of the

Indian Penal Code.

According to the prosecution case, a dead body of a

male age about 25 years was found and accordingly the

police prepared inquest report and registered an F.I.R.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner

submits that the petitioner, who is of clean antecedent, is

innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He

further submits that the instant F.I.R. has been registered



against unknown person but the petitioner has been made accused in this case on his self confession during course of investigation. Save and except the confession, no cogent material has surfaced against the petitioner during course of investigation. The petitioner is rotting in judicial custody since 08.05.2022.

Learned counsel for the informant as well as learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submit that it has come during course of investigation that the petitioner along with other accused persons have committed murder of the deceased. It has further submitted that the petitioner himself admitted his involvement in the commission of murder of the deceased, this fact has emerged in paragraph-52 of the case diary. Apart from that paragraph-32 of the case diary suggest that the petitioner was in continuous touch with the deceased before his death. It is also evident from the paragraph 82 of the case diary, which is supervision report, that the petitioner and another accused, namely, Rahul Kumar had hatched a conspiracy and committed murder of the deceased. Hence the petitioner does not deserve to be enlarged on bail.



Considering the facts and circumstances of the case
and the material collected during investigation in this case, I
am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.
Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

brajesh/-

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

