

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.55560 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-56 Year-2024 Thana- PAHARKATTA District- Kishanganj

Suleman @ Gulpar Alam S/O Safir Alam R/O Khajurbari, P.s.- Paharkatta,
Dist.- Kishanganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Umeshanand Pandit, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 12-08-2025 Heard Mr. Dilip Kumar Singh, learned counsel for
the petitioner and learned APP representing the State.

2. The petitioner is in custody in connection with S.T.
No. 184 of 2024 arising out of Pakarkatta P.S. Case No. 56 of
2024 for the offence punishable under sections 302 and 34 of
the Indian Penal Code, lodged on 30.05.2024 by the informant,
Firoz Ansari.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant alleged
that he got an information that his brother Saheb @
Kamruzamma Ansari has been killed by slitting his neck,
accordingly, the F.I.R.

4. During the investigation according to the learned
counsel for the petitioner it was Sakil who was picked up and he
gave the name of other co-accused including this petitioner, this



led to their implication.

5. The submission before this Court is that the others who were named by Sakil have been extended relief and attached as Annexure-2 series.

6. Learned APP has pointed out that in the case of Subhan @ Gulzar (Cr. Misc. No. 22206 of 2025), the submission before the concerned coordinate Bench was that he has been named in the confessional statement of Suleman whereas here it is being averred that the name of Suleman came in the confessional statement of Sakil.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner has taken this Court to the learned Sessions Judge order to show that it has been recorded in paragraph no.41 of the case diary that Sakil has made a confessional statement.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts as also that the petitioner is in custody since 03.06.2024 having no criminal antecedent, others have been granted bail, this Court is inclined to extend him the privilege of bail subject to the satisfaction of the court that it was a confessional statement of Sakil and not Suleman.

9. However, if it is found that it was the petitioner Suleman who was picked up and he made confessional



statement and/or it is found that he has criminal antecedent, the order shall become infructuous.

10. Let the petitioner be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Kishanganj, in connection with S.T. No. 184 of 2024 arising out of Pakarkatta P.S. Case No. 56 of 2024 subject to the following conditions:

(i) one of the bailor should be the family member/relative of the petitioner who shall provide official document to show his/her bona fide;

(ii) the petitioner shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner shall appear before the concerned police station every fortnight for six months to mark his attendance;

(iv) the petitioner shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds;



(v) the petitioner shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of his bail bonds.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

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

