

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72361 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-130 Year-2023 Thana- HASANPUR District- Samastipur

MD. AMZAD @ MD. AMJAD S/o Md. Ibrahim Resident of Village -
Khawas Tola, Kale Narpatnagar , P.S.- Hasanpur, District - Samastipur
(Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Madhav Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Girish Chandra Jha, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

4 13-10-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Hasanpur P.S. Case No. 130 of 2023, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 120B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The informant is mother of the deceased. She states that marriage of her son (deceased) was solemnized with Lalo Devi. She states further that Lalo Devi had illicit relation with the petitioner for which there was altercation between the deceased and Lalo Devi. On 16.07.2023 at 04:00 A.M., the informant heard the sound of moaning and when she went to the room, she saw the petitioner running away from there and also



saw Lalo Devi pressing her son on the ground. She found her son in a pool of blood and noticed cut injury on throat of her son. The doctors at Sadar Hospital, Samastipur declared her son as dead.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated. There is nothing against him except the confessional statement of co-accused Lalo Devi.

5. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the informant as well as learned APP for the State have opposed the prayer for bail by submitting that the informant had seen the petitioner fleeing away from her house and saw her son in pool of blood. There was illicit relationship between the petitioner and wife of the deceased for which an altercation had already been taken place.

6. Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

AjayMishra/-

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

