

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.82933 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-316 Year-2024 Thana- MOHANIYA District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

Shyam Narayan Singh @ Shyam Narain Singh Son of Radhe Shyam Singh @
Ghora Resident of village-Naraura, P.S.-Mohania, District-Kaimur at Bhabua

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajani Kant Pandey, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Pushpa Sinha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 04-02-2025 Heard Mr. Rajani Kant Pandey, learned counsel for

the petitioner, Mr. Pushpa Sinha, learned APP for the State and

learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner has prayed for regular bail in a case
registered for the offence punishable under sections
364/120(B), 302 and 210 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the son of the
informant, namely, Anil Kumar Goswami was missing from the
night of 28.05.2024. The informant has stated in the FIR that the
petitioner, Jyoti Kumari was on talking terms with the son of the
informant. It has been suspected that she had kidnapped and
killed the son of the informant. After some days, the dead body
of the son of the informant was recovered. Accordingly the FIR
was lodged.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that name of the petitioner has surfaced on the basis of the confessional statement of Jyoti Kumari and after arrest, this petitioner has also given his confessional statement and on the basis of his self-confession, dead body was recovered. It has further been submitted that from perusal of the photograph and arrest of this petitioner, it will transpire that the petitioner was arrested prior to the photograph whereas it has been submitted that dead body was recovered on his self-confession. This part of the confessional statement is falsified. Further it has been found that the mobile of the deceased was also recovered from the possession of the petitioner. Regarding this recovery, it is clear that learned counsel for the petitioner only the above argument that as he was arrested after the recovery as such, every thing is planned but the recovery of mobile cast a doubt on the petitioner. Moreover, the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 30.05.2024.

5. Learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposed the prayer of regular bail stating that the mobile of the deceased was recovered from the possession of the petitioner. As such, the petitioner does not deserve bail.

Considering the submissions put forward by the



parties and the materials available on the case diary, I am not inclined to extend him the privilege of bail which is accordingly rejected.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Jagdish/-

U			
---	--	--	--

