

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32200 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-344 Year-2024 Thana- KALYANPUR District- Samastipur

Sudhir Madhan @ Sudhir Kumar @ Sudhir Kumar Madhan S/O Tek Chand
Madhan R/O Ward 20 Gudri Bazaar, P.s.- Town Thana, Dist.- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dinu Kumar, Adv. Mr. Vardaan Mangalam, Adv. Ms. Kitika Rani, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Anish Chandra

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

2 19-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The prosecution case, as disclosed in the FIR, is that on 21.12.2024 at about 09:30 AM, the informant's father had gone along with the petitioner and at about 12:50 PM, an information reached that his father was murdered by some unknown miscreants. Upon such information, the informant reached the place of occurrence and found his father's dead body on an E-rickshaw and the driver of the rickshaw was also shot dead while the petitioner was standing there and he claimed that he



can identify the assailants.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present FIR has been lodged against unknown culprits and the bare perusal of the FIR would show that the deceased had gone along with the petitioner and the petitioner was very much present at the place of occurrence and it is he who confirmed that some unknown miscreants had come on a motorcycle and shot the deceased. It is further submitted that had the petitioner got any complicity in the said occurrence, he would not have remained standing at the place of occurrence for the family members of the deceased to arrive. The informant or his other family members also did not raise any suspicion against the petitioner at the time of the institution of the FIR and it is only after 70 days of the occurrence that the informant has raised a suspicion against the present petitioner also. It is an admitted position that there is no eyewitness to the occurrence and further, it is submitted that there is no recovery of any incriminating article from the possession of the petitioner. It is next submitted that the petitioner in custody since 13.03.2025 and he is aged about 68 years.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail.

6. Considering the above-mentioned facts and



circumstances, the above named petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Kalyanpur P.S. Case No. 344 of 2024.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

divyanshi/-

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

