

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32153 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-25 Year-2026 Thana- PURNEA SADAR District- Purnia

Sonu Kumar @ Sainti @ Sonu S/o Shiv Narayan Mahto R/o Village-
Khushkibagh, P.s.- Khushkibagh, District- Purnea

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Prashant Kumar, Advocate Mr. Uday Prakash Sharma, Advocate Mr. Kaushik Anand, Advocate Mr. Divyansh Kumar, Advocate Mr. Gyaneshwar Shandilya, Advocate Mr. Aman Raj, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Shyam Kumar Singh, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Parth Sarthy, Advocate Mr. Diwakar Kumar, Advocate Mr. Rohit Kumar, Advocate Mr. Priya Raj, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 22-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State. Perused
the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Purnea
P.S. Case No. 25 of 2026 instituted for the offences under
Sections 103(1), 61(2), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,
2023.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that the accused
persons, pursuant to a criminal conspiracy, allegedly murdered
informant's brother, namely, Md. Afjal in a hotel room and



staged his death as a suicide by hanging after he had expressed apprehension of being killed in a WhatsApp audio message.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case merely on the basis of suspicion. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that general and omnibus allegation has been made against the petitioner. No specific overt act is alleged against the petitioner. Informant is not the eye-witness to the occurrence. No incriminating article has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel further contended that no external injury on the body of the deceased as per post-mortem report, rules out any struggle or use of force while committing the murder of the deceased. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 14.01.2026 and has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned counsel for the informant further submitted that that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and is alleged to have been a part of the criminal conspiracy resulting in the murder of the deceased. It is further contended that, prior to his death, the deceased had sent a WhatsApp audio



message expressing apprehension that the accused persons, including the petitioner, were going to kill him. Learned counsel jointly submitted that considering the gravity and seriousness of the offence and the materials collected during investigation, petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as also the material available in the case diary, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

8. Learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.

9. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew the prayer for grant of bail before the Trial Court if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from today.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

