

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6675 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-119 Year-2024 Thana- BENIPATTI District- Madhubani

Amrendra Kumar @ Amrendra Kumar Jha @ Sonu Jha S/o Shri Baidyanath
Jha R/o Village - Damodarpur, P.S - Benipatti, District - Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajesh Ranjan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Tiwary, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 16-02-2026 Heard the parties.

2. This is the second attempt of the petitioner for grant of regular bail in connection with Benipatti P.S. Case No. 119 of 2024 registered for the offence under Sections 302 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 15.05.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 30656 of 2025 which reads as under:-

*Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.*

*2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection
with Benipatti P.S. Case No. 119 of 2024 registered for
the offence under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal
Code.*

*3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner and
other accused named in the FIR are said to have killed
the deceased. The petitioner has call the deceased from*



his house and has taken him away on his motorcycle and thereafter the dead body of the deceased was found on which there were anti-mortem injuries also.

4. The petitioner is in custody since 12.12.2024.

5. Considering the role of the petitioner in the killing of the deceased, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

3. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is in custody since 12.12.2024 and has clean antecedent.

4. Learned counsel for the informant submits that co-accused Javed has delayed the trial by filing a discharge application and now discharge application has been dismissed and charges are to be framed.

5. Considering the gravity of offence and the fact that the charges are going to be framed, this Court finds no ground to review its earlier order.

6. Accordingly, this application is dismissed again and prosecution is directed to adduce the evidence after framing of charge.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

tusharika/-

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

