

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9884 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-253 Year-2024 Thana- SANGRAMPUR District- East
Champaran

Muslim Alam S/o Babudadin Mian @ Babudin Miyan R/O Vill.- Dilaman
Chhapara P.S- Kesariya Dist- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ansul, Sr. Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rajendra Prasad Nat, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 12-05-2025 Heard Mr. Ansul, learned senior counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Rajendra Prasad Nat, learned APP for the

State.

2. Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with

Sangrampur P.S. Case No. 253/ 2024 dated 06.10.2024

registered for the offence(s) punishable under Section(s) 103,

3(5) and 61(2) of the BNS and section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution's case, the informant's

daughter, Sima Devi was shot dead when she was sleeping and

the informant alleged that all the accused persons named in the

FIR hatched up a conspiracy and killed her daughter.

4. The main submissions advanced by the learned

senior counsel for the petitioner are that the petitioner is not



named in the FIR, he has been made accused during the course of investigation mainly on the basis of an information given by a spy and according to the said information, co-accused, Vikash Kumar and Jokhu Prasad hired this petitioner to kill the victim, Sima Devi and thereafter as per the prosecution, the petitioner's location was found near the place of the occurrence during the relevant time but except these materials which do not come in the purview of any direct evidence there is nothing against the petitioner who has been made accused and he has been languishing in jail since 18.10.2024. It is further submitted that FIR in this case was lodged on 06.10.2024 but its copy was sent to the concerned court nine days after its registration and regarding the said delay, there is no explanation. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner has fair and clean antecedent.

5. Learned APP appearing for the State has opposed the bail prayer of the petitioner.

6. Heard both the sides and perused the FIR and case diary of this case. The instant matter relates to the murder of the informant's daughter on account of some money transaction dispute relating to land running in between the named accused persons and the deceased and the alleged occurrence is said to have been committed in furtherance of a conspiracy hatched up



by the accused persons, though, against this petitioner there is no direct evidence at this stage, however, as per the prosecution it came into light during the investigation that petitioner and one co-accused were hired by two named accused persons to kill the deceased, thereafter, investigation was made with regard to the presence of the petitioner at or near the place of occurrence during the relevant time of period on the basis of technical surveillance and upon that his presence was found near the place of occurrence and in this regard, paragraphs nos. 41 and 47 of the case diary are relevant and the investigation is still pending in respect of other accused persons. Considering these facts, this court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail at this stage. Accordingly, his prayer stands rejected.

7. The petitioner may renew his bail prayer after completion of investigation on all aspects.

(Shailendra Singh, J)

BKS/-

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

