

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63973 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-85 Year-2024 Thana- KATIHAR NAGAR District- Katihar

Karan Kumar @ Karan Kr. Chouhan S/O Prakash Chouhan R/O Village-
Bheria Rahika, Ward No. 02, P.S. - Sahayak, District - Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajendra Prasad Sah, Advocate

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

For the Informant : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Singh, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

5 17-12-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP

for the State and learned counsel for the informant. Perused the

case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Katihar
(Sahayak) P.S. Case No. 85 of 2024 instituted for the offences
under Sections 363, 365 of the Indian Penal Code, subsequently,
Sections 302, 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code was added.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that, on the alleged
date and time, the son of the informant went out of home but did
not return.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the
petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case.
Petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. The name of the petitioner
transpired in this case on the basis of suspicion. It has been



submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 15.02.2024 and has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP further submitted that as per paragraph no. 45 of the case diary, this petitioner himself confessed his guilt and narrated the manner in which he committed the murder of the deceased. Learned APP further submitted that as per post-mortem report of the deceased, the cause of the death is haemorrhagic and neurogenic shock caused by blunt force which is in accordance with the story narrated by the petitioner in his confessional statement. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant, therefore, pray that petitioner may not be released on bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, material available in the case diary which is further supported by the post-mortem report, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this juncture.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail is rejected.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

