

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30146 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-702 Year-2023 Thana- FATUA District- Patna

Mintush Kumar @ Minta @ Mantu Kumar @ Mintush S/o Munarik Singh
R/o Village- Niyazipur, P.S.- Fatuha, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Mickey Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Chandra Bhushan Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P.
for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Fatuha
P.S. Case No. 702/2023 for the offences punishable under section
302/34/120(B) of the Indian Penal Code and 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner
has antecedent of five cases and is in custody since 18.12.2025, it is
next submitted that from perusal of allegation as alleged in the FIR, it
would manifest that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence
but alleges that his son was killed by the named accused persons
including the petitioner. The learned counsel submits that no doubt son
of the informant was killed but then allegation of firing is not specific
since informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence. It is also
submitted that this court granted privilege of anticipatory bail to Ram
Suhawan Gop in Cr. Misc. No 43961 of 2024 by order dated



21.08.2024 for which the learned A.P.P also submits that Ram Suhawan Gop was a senior citizen and was a person with clean antecedent but petitioner has antecedent of five cases.

4. At this stage, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that Mithlesh Kumar has approached this court seeking bail by filling Cr. Misc. No. 79286 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 25.11.2025 with the condition that petitioner would be released after framing of charge, if not already framed. It is also submitted that even Mithlesh Kumar has antecedent of four cases .

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner and submits that since petitioner has antecedent of five cases and if privilege of regular bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail. Therefore, the prayer for bail of this petitioner is rejected.

7. However petitioner would have at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge, if not already framed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

sanjeev/-vikram/

U			
---	--	--	--

