

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18011 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-186 Year-2024 Thana- RANIYATALAB District- Patna

Md. Samim @ Jamshed @ Shekh Samim S/o Md. Mursid R/o Village-
Kelabari, P.S- Puraini, Dist- Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey, Advocate.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Manish Prakash, Advocate.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Binod Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 15-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Raniya Talab P.S. Case No. 186 of 2024 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 302 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier the bail petition of this petitioner was rejected vide order dated 22.03.2025 with a liberty to renew his prayer for bail after six months.

4. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that some unknown miscreants have killed the husband of the informant. The brother of the informant namely, Shamsheer has given in his



confessional statement that he has directed the petitioner to kill the husband of the informant (deceased). He also submits that Save and except confessional statement of the brother, there is nothing against him. In Para 14 of the case diary, there is description of CCTV footage and the petitioner was identified by the villagers in CCTV footage and was found in dubious circumstances on the date of the occurrence and the blood stain clothes which he was keeping in a bag was also recovered.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a report from the learned trial court has been called and from the report of the learned trial court, it is clear that only two witnesses have been examined till today.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that a statement has been made in para 3 of the petition that petitioner has no criminal antecedent and he is languishing in judicial custody since 28.05.2024.

7. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage, however he may renew his prayer for bail after six months if the



trial is not concluded.

9. Learned trial court is directed to conclude the trial within same time.

10. This Court would advise the learned trial court to conduct a calendar trial for expeditious disposal of the present case.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

