

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18984 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-62 Year-2024 Thana- LAKHAURA District- East Champaran

Sonu Kumar @ Sonu Yadav @ Rishiranjjan Kumar Son of Late Nand Lal Rai
@ Nandlal Prasad Yadav Resident of Village - Naurangiya, P.S. - Lakhaura,
Dist. - East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Abhishek Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Ajit Kumar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Shashi Bhushan Pandey, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 24-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP
for the State and learned counsel for the Informant.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Session Trial No. 187 of 2026 arising out of Lakhaura P.S. Case No.62 of 2024 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 302, 120(B) and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that when the informant was sitting at his door, accused persons called his son and took him for a feast. After considerable time, when the informant called on his son's mobile, it was switched off. In morning, search was made and he was found in injured condition and he has named 12 persons. Subsequently he died.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the



petitioner has submitted that in this case there is no eye-witness. As far as the statement of the deceased is concerned, from perusal of the FIR itself it is clear that the body was recovered at 04:00 AM on 12.06.2024 but the FIR has been lodged on 13.06.2024 at 08:30 AM, after delay of more than 24 hours. It has further been submitted that this case is based on circumstantial evidence. During course of investigation, the petitioner along with others have given their confessional statement. Save and except the confessional statement there is nothing against the petitioner. It has further been submitted that after investigation police has submitted final form whereas the learned Jurisdictional magistrate relied on the information of the police and has taken cognizance. It has further been submitted that cognizance is not a material for considering the bail. In entire case diary, save and except confessional statement, there is nothing against the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that similarly situated co-accused have been granted bail by this Court vide Cr. Misc. No. 70038 of 2024 with Cr. Misc. No. 71156 of 2024 and by the learned Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide Cr. Misc. No. 83633 of 2024. Learned counsel has lastly submitted that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 17.01.2026.



5. The application for bail is opposed by learned counsel for the Informant.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The above named petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail 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 court of learned Additional District & Sessions Judge-II, East Champaran, Motihari, in connection with Session Trial No. 187 of 2026 arising out of Lakhaura P.S. Case No.62 of 2024.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

durgesh/-

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

