

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26482 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-137 Year-2024 Thana- HASANPUR District- Samastipur

Garib Das @ Sonu Kumar Singh @ Sonu Kumar Son of Chandrakant Singh  
village- Atapur, Ps- Hasanpur, Dist- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                                |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mrs. Vaishnavi Singh, Advocate |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr. Prem Kumar Jha, APP        |
| For the Informant        | : | Mr. Aditya Raj, Advocate       |

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

ORAL ORDER

4      10-10-2025                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned  
APP for the State, learned counsel for the informant and perused  
the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with  
Hasanpur P.S. Case No. 137 of 2024, instituted for the offences  
punishable under Sections 103(1), 61(2) and 3(5) of the  
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the petitioner  
along with other co-accused persons have committed murder of  
informant's brother while he was returning from a feast on  
07.11.2024. The informant claimed that co-accused Dhananjay  
has strangled the deceased with a rope and staged it as a suicide  
due to a prior dispute involving an illicit affair.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the allegation is not specific rather the same is general and omnibus in nature. It is next submitted that the deceased has committed suicide. The informant is not an eye witness of the said occurrence. The petitioner is in custody since 12.11.2024 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that there is specific allegation against the petitioner and the witnesses have supported the prosecution case, which fact is mentioned in paragraph nos. 05, 06, 09 and 21 of the case diary. Learned counsel for the informant further submits that the trial is in progress and 3 out of 6 witnesses have already been examined in this case. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence as also present stage of the case, this Court is not inclined to



grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial. However, if the trial is not concluded within a period of two months from the date of receipt/production, the petitioner will have liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the Court below.

**(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)**

Rajorshi/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

