

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20485 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-116 Year-2024 Thana- JANDAHA District- Vaishali

Devendra Singh @ Tuntun Singh Son of Dukhit Singh Resident Of Village -
Arniya, Ward No 11, P.S. - Jandaha, Dist. - Vaishali At Hajipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sachin Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Md. Mushtaque Alam, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Amir Hodda, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 03-07-2026 Heard the learned Advocate for the petitioner, the
learned APP for the State and the learned Advocate for the
informant.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail, who is in custody
in connection with Jandaha P.S. Case No. 116 of 2024,
registered for the offence punishable under Sections 363 and
365 of the Indian Penal Code. Later on, Sections 302, 201 and
120(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code were added.

3. This is the second attempt made on behalf of the
petitioner, as earlier the prayer for bail of the petitioner was
rejected by this Court vide order dated 04.10.2024 in Cr. Misc.
No. 70964 of 2024, while taking into consideration the facts
inter alia confession of the petitioner, leading to recovery of the



dead body of the son of the informant.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submitted that undoubtedly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner was rejected earlier, but now the charges have already been framed against the petitioner on 10.02.2025 and this petitioner has been incarcerated in judicial custody since 27.04.2024; thus more than two years have been lapsed. It is also contended that one of the co-accused, namely, Puja Kumari (wife of the present petitioner), she has also been extended privilege of regular bail vide order dated 28.08.2024 in Cr. Misc. No. 59761 of 2024.

5. On the other hand, learned APP for the State and the informant vehemently oppose the bail application and submit that it is the petitioner, on whose confession, the dead body of the son of the informant was recovered and the land dispute between the parties clearly suggest the motive of the petitioner, besides he also carries one criminal antecedent over his head.

6. Regard being had to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and taking note of the fact that now the charges have already been framed and as per the report furnished by the District and Additional Sessions Judge-VIII, Vaishali at Hajipur, out of seven charge-sheet witnesses, one



witness, namely, Shila Devi, has been examined and there is every likelihood of conclusion of trial in near future, besides the specific accusation against the petitioner and the materials suggesting active participation of the petitioner in the crime, this Court is not acceded to the prayer of the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

7. However, it is expected that the learned trial Court shall take all sincere efforts to conclude the trial, expeditiously.

8. It is made clear that if the trial is not concluded within a period of one year, the petitioner shall be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Harish Kumar, J)

shivank/-

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

