

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20699 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-380 Year-2024 Thana- KANTI District- Muzaffarpur

Sanjiv Singh S/O Baijnath Singh @ Baidyanath Singh Resident of Village-
Harka, P.S- Minapur, District- Muzaffarpur (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Nachiketa Jha, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Renu Kumari, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

3 15-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Kanti
P.S. Case No. 380 of 2024 instituted for the offences under
Sections 103(1), 238, 61, 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. As per prosecution case, the allegation against the
accused persons including the petitioner is of committing
murder of the informant's husband Ritesh Kumar.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged
against him and has falsely been implicated in the present case.
He further submits that there is delay of two days in lodging the
F.I.R. that too without there being any plausible explanation for



the same which creates doubt in the veracity of the prosecution case. There is no eye-witness to the alleged occurrence. Even the informant is not the eye-witness. There is no specific or direct allegation of any overt act against the petitioner rather the same is general and omnibus in nature. The petitioner has no concern with the family matters of the deceased and his wife. The police arrested the petitioner and took his confessional statement which has no evidentiary value in the eye of law. He further submits that nothing incriminating has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged occurrence. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent and is languishing in judicial custody since 22.10.2024 without any rhymes or reason.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner again submits that the co-accused Bhagwan Singh and Komal Kumari have been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 17.02.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 88134 of 2024.

6. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, stating that the offence alleged is serious in nature. There is direct allegation against the petitioner of being involved in the alleged occurrence. He has also confessed his guilt in his



confessional statement. The Informant in the re-statement has corroborated the allegation made in the F.I.R. Several witnesses have also supported the prosecution case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. The petitioner is named in the F.I.R. and, hence, he does not deserve bail.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner, above named, is rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously preferably within a period of six months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of six months as stated above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

