

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32224 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-157 Year-2024 Thana- SHEOHAR District- Sheohar

Mukesh Paswan S/o Janki Paswan R/o Village- Harnahiya,P.S.- Sheohar,
District- Sheohar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amrendra Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Uday Pratap Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

3 20-06-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for
the offence punishable under Sections 302 and 201/34 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. The allegation in the first information report is
that the informant's daughter, Amrita Devi, who was earlier
married to one Ram Sringer Paswan, was, subsequently, trapped
by Mukesh Paswan by enticing her into love affair and, later on,
kidnapped her daughter, Nayra. It is alleged that one Deokali
Devi took the responsibility of the girl, took her and Amrita
Devi, where they started living with the petitioner after
solemnizing the marriage. Further allegation is that on
12.05.2024, the informant received information that Amrita



Devi and her three years daughters have been murdered and their dead body have been disappeared to conceal the evidence of the crime.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is not involved in the present case, rather the earlier husband of Amrita Devi, Ram Sringar Paswan is responsible for the death of the deceased. It is further submitted that the F.I.R. has been lodged after a long delay of 25 days for which no explanation has been tendered. It is further submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 17.10.2024 without any fault.

5. Learned APP for the State vehemently opposing the bail petition submitted that the thrust of the allegation of committing the death of both Amrita Devi and her minor daughter is upon the petitioner, hence the petitioner does not deserve privilege of bail. It is further submitted that the charges have been framed in the case and one witness has been examined.

6. Considering the entire the facts and circumstances of the case as well as the fact that there is specific allegation upon the petitioner, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The prayer for bail is hereby rejected.



7. However, the learned Trial Court is directed to conclude the trial as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of nine months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order. Both the parties are expected to extend their co-operation in early conclusion of the trial. If the trial is not concluded within the period as aforesaid, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

Trivedi/-

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

