

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12366 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1 Year-2024 Thana- DHARHARA District- Munger

Bharat Prasad Singh @ Bharat Kumar Singh S/O Late Raghvendra Narayan
Singh R/O Vill.- Bathaniyan, P.S- Rajaun, Dist.- Banka

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ritesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dinesh Singh, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Raj Kishore Prasad, Advocate

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

ORAL ORDER

5 01-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State. Perused
the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Dharahara P.S. Case No. 1 of 2024 instituted for the offences
under Sections 324, 302, 120B, 34 of the Indian Penal Code
and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that, the accused
persons hatched a conspiracy and killed the informant's husband
and one Shailendra Kumar by firing upon their head.

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 confessional statement of co-accused Mukul Kumar. No specific overt act is alleged against the petitioner. Learned counsel further submitted that except confessional statement of the co-accused, there is no material against this petitioner to prove his involvement in the alleged offence. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 16.11.2024 and has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP further submitted that as per the material available in the case diary, co-accused Mukul Singh has specifically stated the involvement of the petitioner in the alleged occurrence and as per paragraph no. 49 of the case diary, this petitioner has also disclosed his involvement in the alleged offence. Learned APP further submitted that there is sufficient material against the petitioner including the CDR report (as per paragraph no. 140 of the case diary) to show his involvement in the commission of double murder of the deceased. Learned APP lastly submitted that the prayer for grant of bail of co-accused persons has already been rejected by this Court vide order dated 18.11.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 56686 of 2024.



6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of offence as also there being ample material in the case diary to prove the involvement of the petitioner in the alleged offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

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

8. Learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.

9. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew the prayer for grant of bail before the Trial Court if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from today.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

