

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49719 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1007 Year-2024 Thana- DANAPUR District- Patna

Sobodh Kumar Singh @ Subodh Gop S/O Dwarika Rai @ Dwarika Gop R/O
Vill.- Lakhani Bigha, P.S.- Danapur, Dist.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Krishna Prabhat, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bhanu Pratap 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. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Danapur P.S. Case No. 1007 of 2024, instituted for the offences
punishable under Sections 190, 191(2), 115(2), 117(2), 103,
351(2) and 352(3)(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, petitioner
abused and pushed the informant making him fall. Then the
petitioner along with other co-accused persons brutally
assaulted son of the informant. It is further alleged that
petitioner pressed a rod on the chest of informant's son, causing
suffocation and death.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Specific allegation of assault is levelled allegedly against petitioner. It is further submitted that there is case and counter case between the parties. The petitioner is in custody since 10.01.2025 and has got two criminal antecedents. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that co-accused has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 03.04.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 18871 of 2025.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. As per postmortem report, cause of death is not ascertained, but there is direct allegation against the petitioner, hence he does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and taking into the fact that there is direct allegation against the petitioner that he pressed a rod on the chest of informant's son, causing suffocation and death, this Court at this stage is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer for bail is *rejected*.

7. The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as



expeditiously as possible without any undue delay and unnecessary adjournments.

8. However, petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail, if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from today.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

