

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9392 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-47 Year-2002 Thana- BIHTA District- Patna

Kariman Yadav Son of Late Rampravesh Yadav Resident of Village Etwa,
Police Station - Danapur, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satish Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Madan Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 11-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Bihta
P.S. Case No. 47 of 2002, registered for the offences punishable
under Sections 302 and 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and is in custody since
18.10.2025 and the informant alleges that his son, namely,
Ashok Kumar, on 05.03.2002, left the house at 01:30 P.M.
telling his wife that he is going to get his bicycle repaired and
will also purchase medicine and thereafter will go to the factory
then will come back home, next alleges that his son worked in
Balmukund Iron Factory and used to leave the house at 06:00
am and returned by 08:00 P.M. but when his son did not return



on 05.03.2002, the informant thought his shift in the factory might have changed and will come back in the morning of 06.03.2002, further, his brother, at 09:00 A.M., on 06.03.2002, disclosed that Ashok has been killed and the dead body is lying in Itawa Badhar, accordingly, the informant reached the place of occurrence and saw the dead body of his son lying with mark of injuries on his mouth and nose and was strangled to death, further, he came to know that on 05.03.2002, at 02:30 P.M., the deceased had visited a liquor kiln, further, the slipper found at the place of occurrence does not belong to the deceased.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR is against unknown and the name of the petitioner transpired during the course of investigation in the confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value. It is also submitted that petitioner is aged about 75 years.

5. Learned A.P.P. Mr. Madan Kumar vehemently opposes the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner and submits that the case is of the year 2002 and from perusal of the order impugned, it would manifest that even investigation got completed in the year 2002 but then petitioner seems was absconding for the last more than 22 years which has hampered



the trial. It is also submitted that petitioner is in custody since 18.10.2025 and if privilege of regular bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond. It is also submitted that no doubt petitioner as of now is 75 years of age but when the occurrence was committed in the year 2002 the petitioner was barely more than 50 years. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that similarly situated co-accused Shankar Pandey had approached this court seeking regular bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.18885 of 2002 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 06.01.2003, on which, the learned APP submits that Shankar Pandey had approached the court in the year 2002 itself.

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

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

8. The petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

