

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.85988 of 2024

Arising out of PS. Case No.-97 Year-2024 Thana- NAUBATPUR District- Patna

Lal Bahadur Singh @ Bahadur S/o Late Musafir Singh Present Resident at Mohalla-Harnichak, Ward No.-14, Police Station Beur, District-Patna. Permanent Resident of Village Gopi Bigha, Police Station - Obra, District - Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shailesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s: Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

5 01-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the state.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case instituted for the offences under Sections 302, 201 and 120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code. He has no criminal antecedent.

3. The prosecution case in short as per *fardbeyan* of the informant, Panpati Devi is that her nephew (Bhagina) Manoj Kumar came to his house and spoke to her deceased-husband namely Lal Babu to go for a walk, then her husband went out with him at night. It is further alleged that her husband while leaving his house told her that he is going to meet with one Bahadur @ Lal Bahadur Singh (Petitioner), thereafter, she received an information that an unidentified dead body was recovered



and when she went there she identified her husband. It is also alleged that she has suspected about the killing of her husband against one Yogendra Kumar, who is father-in-law (Samdhi) of her son Sudhir Kumar @ Munna since there was land dispute between them and further disclosed the name of the Petitioner namely Lal Bahadur Singh @ Bahadur, who is also involved in killing of her husband, since deceased.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case merely on suspicion as he appears to be the neighbour of the co-accused Yogendra Kumar, who is father-in-law (Samdhi) of the son of the informant. It is further submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that from perusal of the *fardbeyan* it is evident that there are a number of land disputes between the informant's husband and the father-in-law (Samdhi) of the son of the Informant. It is also submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that there is no eye-witness to the occurrence. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent and is in custody since 27.07.2024.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and has submitted that the petitioner is one of the accomplice in



killing of the husband of the informant and has also confessed his involvement in the crime and the police has submitted charge-sheet against the petitioner, as from the electronic evidence collected by the Police it was found that the Petitioner was in contact with the deceased and had also evaded after the incident, as such the petitioner should not be released on bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions of learned counsel and taking into account the *prima facie* evidence collected during the course of investigation, I am not inclined to grant bail to the Petitioner.

7. The application for bail is rejected.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Vikash/-

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

