

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.82870 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-108 Year-2024 Thana- KHIRI MORE District- Patna

1. Uditya Kumar @ Aditya Kumar S/o Mahendra Yadav R/o Village- Mahuari, PS- Paypura Khirimore, Distt.- Patna
2. Dillu Kumar S/o Lalkeshwar Yadav R/o vill - Maheshpur, P.S. - Khirimore, Distt.- patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dhirendra Kumar Sinha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. B.N. Pandey, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 04-03-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners have prayed for regular bail in a case registered for the offence punishable under sections 302, 201, 120(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case of the prosecution is that 24.05.2024, the husband of the informant was shot dead by unknown miscreants while he was returning from Reganiya Dih Balu Ghat.

4. During the course of investigation, the petitioners have given their confessional statement in which they have stated the manner how they have committed the offence. In paragraph-65 of the case diary, the tower location of the mobile of the petitioners was collected and it is found that the tower location of the petitioners was found at the place where the deceased was found.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in connection with the present case. It is further submitted that in this case, inquest report, post-mortem report and cremation was done before the filing of the FIR. It is also submitted that none of the witnesses have named these petitioners. Moreover, the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 27.07.2024.

5. Learned APP appearing for the state has opposed the prayer of regular bail stating that though the witnesses have not named these petitioners but the confessional statement corroborated by the tower location of their mobiles and as such, the petitioners does not deserve bail.

6. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions put forward by the parties, I am not inclined to extend them the privilege of bail which is accordingly, rejected.

7. However, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew their prayer for bail after six months, if so advised.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Jagdish/-

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

