

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29289 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-301 Year-2024 Thana- KARPI District- Arwal

Umesh Singh S/o- Late Kashi Singh R/vill- Chauharchak, P.S.- Sahar Telpa,
Distt- Arwal.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 3 06-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offence punishable under Section 103(1) of the BNS.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of two cases but then the petitioner was acquitted in one case, as such, he has antecedent of one case only and is in custody since 02.01.2025. It is further submitted that informant alleges that he was informed by his cousin, namely, Chandan Kumar that his father has been killed. Further, the father of the informant was having dispute relating to land with his cousin, namely, Umesh Singh who used to threatened him, thus, based on suspicion alleges that Umesh Singh killed his father.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that neither the informant nor his cousin, namely, Chandan Kumar are eyewitness to the occurrence, as such, the entire allegation hinges around suspicion. It is next submitted that no doubt, the dispute relating to property was there in between the petitioner and the deceased, as such, he has been implicated. It is also submitted that during the course of investigation also no material transpired apart from suspicion which could connect the petitioner with the offence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant vehemently opposed the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that earlier the petitioner had shot the own brother of the deceased, namely, Ashok Singh on account of dispute relating to property, as such, it is submitted that suspicion raised against the petitioner is not without any reason. It is further submitted that charges till date have not been framed.

6. After hearing the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to release the



petitioner on bail in connection with Karpi P.S. Case No. 301 of 2024 pending in the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Arwal/Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for bail is rejected.

8. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

