

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-185 Year-2025 Thana- CHAPRA TOWN District- Saran

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-185 Year-2025 Thana- CHAPRA TOWN District- Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Alok Kumar Alok, Advocate.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Anurag Singh, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Pratik, Advocate.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 01-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Town P.S. Case No.185/2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 238, 61(2) of the BNS, 2023.

3. The Station House Officer-cum-Investigating Officer of the case, in compliance of the order dated 22.04.2026, is present in the Court.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of three cases and is in custody since 16.10.2025 and the informant alleges that 09.04.2025, his brother Prince was seen with Arbaz Ali but then his brother did



not return home, as such on 10.04.2025 a search was made, when his dead body was found near diyara area of Saryu river and after seeing the body, it appeared that he was assaulted by sharp edged weapon, further alleges based on suspicion that named accused persons in the FIR may be involved in the occurrence.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is not named in the FIR and during the course of investigation his name transpired. The Station House Officer-cum-Investigating Officer of the case, who is present in the court, agrees with the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner is not named in the FIR and his name transpired during the course of investigation. It is submitted that deceased had made a last call to one Umesh as such the Investigating Officer called Umesh, who disclosed that while he was talking to the deceased he heard some voice from behind and thus asked who was present with him, on which, the deceased disclosed that it was this petitioner. It is also submitted that even Sangeeta and Meena during the course of investigation have stated that they had seen this petitioner accompanying the deceased. It is further submitted that during course of investigation, it also



transpired that the deceased was giving tuition to the niece of one Umesh Mishra and they had developed some kind of a bond which was being objected by Umesh for which Umesh even had gone to the house of the deceased and had threatened him but then the deceased did not mend his ways as such he contacted this petitioner who had taken some loan from Umesh Mishra for getting the occurrence committed. It is submitted that the dead body was recovered with mark of injury.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner does not dispute the said submission of the S.H.O.-cum-I.O. of the case but then submits that Umesh Mishra has been granted the privilege of regular bail by an order dated 10.11.2025 in Cr. Misc. No.59181/2025 by a learned coordinate Bench, on which, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that the case of this petitioner is different from the case of Umesh Mishra as during the course of investigation it has come that it was this petitioner who committed the occurrence of killing the deceased. It is next submitted that petitioner has antecedent of four cases and not three cases.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.



8. The regular bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

9. The personal appearance of the SHO-cum-I.O. of the case is dispensed with.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

