

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.45844 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-465 Year-2024 Thana- NAGAR District- Vaishali

S. M. Taiyab @ S.M. Taiyab Parwana son of Late Mohammad Reeyazuddin
Resident Of Mohalla -Noorgola Near East Majar Police Station -Hajipur
Town, Dist- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Syed Ehteshamuddin, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 04-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends arrest in connection with
Hajipur Town P.S. Case No. 465 of 2024, instituted for the
offences punishable under Sections 302, 120(B), 34 of the
Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, the petitioner
along with other co-accused persons shot dead the husband of
the informant under a conspiracy.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the
present case. The petitioner is father of co-accused, namely, Md.
Shahid and no any land was purchased by the husband of the



informant (deceased) under partnership of the petitioner or his son. There is no any eye witness of the alleged occurrence. It is next submitted that the investigating officer has examined CCTV footage but the miscreants who were seen in the footage has not been identified. The petitioner has got no criminal antecedent. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that similarly situated co-accused has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 02.12.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 71319 of 2024.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is named in the FIR and there is allegation against him that he along with other co-accused persons have committed murder of informant's husband under a conspiracy. It is further submitted that informant in her re-statement in paragraph no. 6 of case diary and other witnesses in their statements in paragraph nos. 7 and 8 of the case diary have supported the case of prosecution. 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	
---	--	---	--

