

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16168 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-401 Year-2024 Thana- KUDRA District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

Satyendra Kumar Chaudhary @ Satendra Chaudhary Son of Manoj Chaudhary Resident of Village - Targanj, P.S. - Sasaram, District - Rohtas, Sasaram

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Babu Nandan Prasad, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Nagendra Kumar, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

10 01-09-2025

Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Kudra P.S. Case No. 401 of 2024 registered for the offence under Sections 103(1), 307, 3(5) of BNS and section 27 of Arms Act.

3. The petitioner is named in the F.I.R. and is in custody since 30.10.2024.

4. As per FIR, the informant, his deceased brother (Bhanu Pratap Singh) alongwith cousin brother namely Utkarsh Raghuvanshi chase the miscreants, who made an attempt to commit theft in their house and while chasing, when they came to close to unknown miscreants, one of them open fire upon the brother of the informant, causing his



death.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the FIR was lodged against unknown persons and merely on the basis of suspicion this petitioner was apprehended with present case. It is submitted that on the basis of suspicions arising out of CCTV footage and call detail report, the self confession of petitioner was recorded, in furtherance of which no incrimination material recovered/surfaced as to connect petitioner with crime in question. It is further submitted that the road on which the present occurrence took place is a very busy public road and, therefore, the presence of petitioner at the relevant point of time cannot be viewed with doubt for his involvement with crime in question. While concluding the argument, it is submitted that investigation of this case is completed, for which charge-sheet has been submitted, as such, there is no chance of tampering with the evidence.

6. Learned APP duly assisted by Mr. Nagendra Kumar learned counsel for the informant while opposing the prayer of bail submitted that as per CCTV footage, call data



record (CDR) and the location of mobile of petitioner, it appears that the petitioner was present at the time of occurrence. It is pointed out that a TIP was conducted in jail, where, the eye witness of the occurrence namely Utkarsh Raghuvanshi, identified this petitioner to involve in crime in question. It is submitted that two fired cartridges, blood sample, iron chain cutter and motorcycle was recovered from the second place of occurrence and moreover, the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in six more criminal cases.

7. In view of aforesaid factual submission and by taking note of nature of allegation, where petitioner being accused of a murder was identified by eye witness of the occurrence during TIP, coupled with the fact that petitioner found involved in six more criminal cases, accordingly the prayer of bail of petitioner stands **rejected** herewith.

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J)

Sudha/-

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

