

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26043 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-206 Year-2023 Thana- SAHARSA SADAR District- Saharsa

Alok Kumar Son of Bhupendra Yadav Resident of Village - Pashupalan
Colony, Ward No. 02/12, P.S. - Saharsa, District - Saharsa

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Amarnath Jha
For the State	:	Mr. Tapeswar Sharma

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

6 10-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. This is the second attempt on behalf of the petitioner for grant of bail in connection with S.T. No. 366 of 2023 arising out of Saharsa Sadar P.S. Case No. 206 of 2023 registered for the offence under Sections 147, 148, 149, 302, 120(B) of the IPC and 20(1-b)a, 26, 35, 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Earlier, the bail application of the petitioner has been rejected by this Court vide order dated 02.08.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 50610 of 2024, which reads as under:

*“ Heard learned counsel for the petitioner
and learned APP for the State.*

*2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection
with Saharsa Sadar P.S. Case No. 206 of 2023
registered for the offence punishable under*



Sections 147, 148, 149, 302 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 25(1-B)a, 26, 35 and 27 of the Arms Act.

3. All together six persons are named in the FIR. The accused persons are said to have killed the deceased in the Court premises. The petitioner was caught on the spot as one of the accused who participated in the killing of the deceased in the Court premises. The petitioner is in jail since 29.03.2023.

4. Learned APP appearing for the State opposes the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner and submitted that petitioner is named in the FIR and there is specific allegation of killing the deceased against him. During investigation several witnesses have also supported the prosecution case.

5. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the nature of allegation, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

6. Accordingly, the application stands rejected.

7. The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.”

4. As per submission, out of nine witnesses, six witnesses have been examined.

5. Considering the fact that the trial is on the verge of conclusion and also the law laid down by the **Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of X Vs. State of Rajasthan and Anr.**



reported in 2024 SCC Online SC 3539, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this application is dismissed

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

priyanka/-

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

