

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2560 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-369 Year-2024 Thana- EKMA District- Saran

=====

Brajendra Kumar Singh @ Ravindra Singh S/O Late Harinarayan Singh
Resident of Village - Galimapur, P.S- Ekma, District- Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anjani Parashar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Jai Narain Thakur, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Ram Binod Singh, Advocate

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

4 05-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP

for the State as also learned counsel for the informant. Perused

the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Ekma
P.S. Case No. 369 of 2024 instituted for the offence under
Sections 103(1) & 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. As per prosecution case, father of the informant
went missing from his brick-kiln on 12.10.2024. On 14.10.2024,
the informant and others allegedly saw the petitioner, his son
Mritunjay Singh, and unknown persons disposing of the body in
an orchard.

4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner
that the petitioner is in custody since 16-10-2024. Petitioner



bears four criminal antecedents, as per disclosure made in paragraph No. 3 of the bail application.

5. It has been further submitted by the petitioner's counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, due to longstanding enmity with the informant, who is not an eyewitness to the alleged incident. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the FIR is concocted, pointing out that the informant failed to report his father's disappearance promptly, which undermines the credibility of the narrative. The petitioner's counsel highlights that the postmortem report only indicates a skull fracture, contradicting the multiple injuries claimed by the informant. He contends that the allegation of disposing the body in daylight on 14.10.2024 is implausible.

6. 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. It is submitted that postmortem report corroborates the allegation against the petitioner.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, there being direct allegation against the petitioner, this Court, at this stage, is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer for grant of bail is, accordingly, *rejected*.

8. However, petitioner will be at liberty to renew his



prayer for bail, if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from today.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

