

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.34593 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-531 Year-2023 Thana- PAROO District- Muzaffarpur

Arjun Kumar, son of Late Ravindra Singh, Village- Mohjama, P.S. - Paru,
Dist- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Uday Prakash Sharma, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Navin Kumar Pandey, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

4 29-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The accused-petitioner, named in the F.I.R., is apprehending his arrest in connection with Paroo P.S. Case No. 531 of 2023 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the court of learned Judicial Magistrate - 1st Class, (West) Muzaffarpur.

3. As per FIR, informant raised suspicion against the petitioner and others co-accused persons to commit murder of his son as petitioner alongwith other named co-accused persons called his son in evening i.e. about 6:00 P.M. on 14.12.2023, whereafter on 15.12.2023 at about 10:00 A.M.



his dead body was recovered from a nearby local canal.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that allegation raised against petitioner merely on the ground of suspicion as he alongwith other co-accused persons called his son from his house and, thereafter, his dead body was recovered. It is submitted that till now, nothing incriminating appears against this petitioner which may suggest his involvement with the present crime in question except suspicion as expressed through FIR. It is submitted that named co-accused Chhappan Singh and Gautam Ram have inimical terms with the son of the informant.

5. It is pointed out that investigation of this case on all material aspects has been completed in this matter and no further custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears required and, therefore, sending the petitioner to jail would not serve any judicial purpose.

6. Explaining criminal antecedent of the petitioner, it is submitted that petitioner found involved in one more criminal case of petty nature related with essential commodities Act, in



which, he is on bail.

7. Learned A.P.P. for the State, while opposing the prayer of anticipatory bail of the petitioner, submitted that suspicion, as expressed by the informant *qua* involvement of this petitioner, is not unfounded rather he alongwith other co-accused persons particularly co-accused Chhappan Singh and Gautam Ram came to the house of informant and taken away his son on the pretext of attending party and, thereafter his dead body was recovered on next very day.

8. It is submitted by learned A.P.P. that admittedly the son of informant was in inimical terms with Chhappan Singh due to certain monetary dispute. While concluding argument, learned A.P.P. submitted that still this matter is open for investigation.

9. In view of the aforesaid submission and by taking note of the fact as petitioner was one of the co-accused who called the son of the informant from his house, where one of the co-accused was in inimical terms, as discussed aforesaid, coupled with the fact that immediately thereafter son of the informant was murdered, accordingly, prayer of anticipatory



bail of the petitioner stands rejected for the present.

10. If petitioner surrenders before the learned trial court and prays for regular bail, learned trial court may decide the same in accordance with law without being prejudiced by any observation as made by this Court.

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J)

Rajeev/-

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

