

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.98 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-334 Year-2025 Thana- CHENARI District- Rohtas

Dinesh Yadav @ Dinesh Singh S/o Late Sheomangal Yadav @ Late Sheo
Mangal Yadav R/o vill - Auraeya, P.S.- Chenari, Distt.- Rohtas

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Gurucharan Singh S/o Late Ramashish Singh R/o vill - Auraiya, P.S.-
Chenari, Distt.- Rohtas

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Sumeet Kumar Singh, Advocate Ms. Abhilasha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Sadanand Paswan, Spl.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 25-06-2026 Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned
Special Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel for
the respondent.

2. The instant appeal has been filed by the appellant
against the order dated 18.11.2025 passed by learned Special
Judge, SC/ST, Rohtas, Sasaram whereby the prayer for bail of
the appellant in connection with Chenari P.S. Case no. 334 of
2025 under Sections 103(1), 238(a) and 3(5) of BNS and
Sections 3(ii) (v) of SC/ST (POA) Act was rejected.

3. The case of the prosecution is that father of the
respondent, namely, Ramashish Singh had gone for searching
tractor for ploughing the field on 7.08.2025 but he did not



return. He was being searched in entire village. On 10.08.2025, he came to know that the dead body of his father(deceased) was found. It is further alleged that the appellant along with others who are the enemies of the respondent might have killed the deceased.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the appellant that appellant has been falsely implicated in this case. From perusal of the FIR, it is clear that entire FIR is based on suspicion and there is no eye witness. Only ground is that there was enmity and during investigation, it has also come that there has been land dispute between the parties. Moreover, the appellant is languishing in judicial custody since 19.08.2025 having no criminal antecedent.

5. The appeal for bail is opposed by learned Spl. P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the respondent. He has submitted that it is a brutal murder and some parts of the body of the deceased are still missing but he could not connect the appellant with the offence.

6. From perusal of the entire diary, it is also clear that the witnesses who have been examined by I.O. during investigation, have only reiterated the statement of respondent. The appellant has given his confessional statement and from perusal of the



confessional statement of the appellant, it is clear that he has stated that he along with this other accused persons have killed the deceased. Save and except confessional statement of the appellant, there is nothing against him.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of this case as stated above, the Court is inclined to allow this appeal. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed and the impugned order dated 18.11.2025 is hereby set aside.

8. The appellant is directed to be enlarged on bail in connection with Chenari P.S. Case No. 334 of 2025 on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. ten thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Special Judge SC/ST, Rohtas, Sasaram **with the condition that the appellant shall cooperate in trial and shall not threaten any of the witnesses.**

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

durgesh/-

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

