

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48642 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-24 Year-2024 Thana- KADIRGANJ District- Patna

Ravikant Kumar S/o Suraj Kumar R/o Village- Daulatpur, P.O.- Dewan, P.S.-
Kadirganj, Patna, Bihar

The State of Bihar

Versus

... .. Petitioner/s

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prem Ranjan Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

5 19-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends arrest in connection with
Kadirganj P.S. Case No. 24 of 2024, registered under Sections
302/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the informant
got an information that dead body of his younger son, namely,
Pintu Kumar was lying near Dewa bridge along with motorcycle
and it appeared that some unknown persons have committed
murder of his son by assaulting him with iron-rod.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the



present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. Name of the petitioner has transpired in this case on the basis of confessional statement made by co-accused person and the same has got no evidentiary value. It is further submitted that there is no any eye witness of the said occurrence. The petitioner has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that though the petitioner is not named in the FIR but on perusal of paragraph no. 236 of the case diary as well as CDR/SDR, it appears that during investigation, police found the case true against the petitioner with regard to conspiracy and his indulgement along with other co-accused in the alleged heinous crime of committing murder of informant's son. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender in the Court below and pray for regular bail. If any such application is filed, the Court below shall



consider and dispose of the same on its own merit without being
prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

