

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.88060 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-215 Year-2024 Thana- BIRPUR District- Supaul

Sandeep Kumar Das S/o- Sri Dev Lal Das R/o - Madhura West, Ward No.05,
P.S - Narpatganj, District - Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Priya Sharan Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 22-03-2025 Heard Mr. Ashok Kumar, learned counsel for the
petitioner and Mr. Ram Priya Sharan Singh, learned APP for the
State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for regular bail in a case
registered for the offence punishable under Section 302/201 of
the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 16.06.2024, the
petitioner took Umesh Das and both of them went to somewhere
and told the informant that they will return by 10:00 PM. When
the husband of the informant did not return till 10:00 PM, the
informant called on his mobile which was switched off. Then
she enquired from the petitioner, he told her that her husband
had gone with him, but he did not know as to where he was. On
17.06.2024 in the morning at 07:00 AM, the dead body was



found in a pool of blood. The informant has further stated that the petitioner has taken Rupees one *lacs* from the deceased. The deceased used to demand that cash and due to that debt, this offence has been committed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has falsely been implicated in this case. He has got no criminal antecedent. During the course of the investigation, the petitioner has also given his confessional statement, wherein he has confessed his guilt. It is further submitted that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 18.06.2024.

5. Learned APP appearing for the state has opposed the prayer of regular bail and submits that from the perusal of the case diary, it also transpires that the mobile phone of the deceased was recovered from his house. Admittedly, the deceased went with the petitioner. The deceased was carrying a mobile phone, and it was recovered from the possession of the petitioner, who has no plausible answer for possessing that mobile.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage and, as



such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.

7. However, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after six months if the trial is not concluded.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

