

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6854 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-362 Year-2024 Thana- AMAS District- Gaya

Dara Khan Son of Reyaz Khan @ Md. Reyaz Khan Village -Sihuli PS- Amas
District- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rakesh Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umeshanand Pandit, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 23-03-2026 Heard Mr. Rakesh Singh, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Umeshanand Pandit, learned Additional

Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who is in custody since
26.08.2025 in connection with Amas P.S. Case No. 362 of 2024
for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1) and 61 of
BNS and Section 27 of Arms Act.

3. The prosecution story, in brief, is that on 21.10.2024
at about 11.00 AM his son namely Guddu Kumar (deceased) left
the house and at about 8.00 PM when he did not return to the
house then his brother made a telephonic call upon which
Guddu Kumar stated that someone was following him and he
was running towards the hill. Thereafter, the phone of the
deceased got disconnected and subsequently he did not respond



to the repeated calls by his family members. It is further stated that in the morning of 22.10.2024 the informant and others started searching for Guddu Kumar and on 22.10.2024 at about 8.30 AM the informant came to know that the dead body of a person was lying near Bankat hill upon which he went there and found the dead body of his son Guddu Kumar. In the meantime, the Amas Police also arrived at the place of occurrence and sent the dead body of Guddu Kumar for postmortem. The informant suspected that his son Guddu Kumar has been killed under a conspiracy.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and the name of the petitioner has transpired during investigation on the basis of secret information after that the petitioner has also confessed his guilt in the present occurrence and except the aforesaid, no other material have come during investigation to suggest the involvement of the petitioner in the present occurrence.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State, on the other hand, has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that in the confessional statement of the petitioner and other co-accused persons, they have confessed that they have fired upon the victim and the



same is supported by the medical evidence (postmortem report).

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner after arguing for some time seeks permission to withdraw the present application with a liberty to renew his prayer after framing of charge.

7. Accordingly, the bail application stands disposed of as withdrawn.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Gaurav Sinha/-

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

