

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.34151 of 2026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-476 Year-2025 Thana- BAKHTIYARPUR District- Patna

=====

Sujeet Kumar S/o Rajendra Prasad Yadav R/o vill - Karthua, Mahuabag  
gokulpur, P.S.- Harnaut, Distt.- Nalanda at Biharsharif

.. ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                   |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. S.K. Lal, Sr. Advocate        |
|                      |   | Mr. Pritish Kumar Lal, Advocate   |
| For the State        | : | Mr. Kumar Ranjit Ranjan, APP      |
| For the Informant    | : | Mr. Ashok Kumar Kashyap, Advocate |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GIRIJISH KUMAR**

ORAL ORDER

3      24-07-2026                      Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the  
  
petitioner and learned APP appearing on behalf of the State as  
  
well as learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with  
Bakhtiyarpur P.S. Case No. 476 of 2025 registered for the  
offences punishable under sections 108, 80, 238, 3(5), 137(2)  
and 140(3) of B.N.S, 2023 corresponding to under section 306,  
304(B), 201, 34, 363 and 364(A) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case in short is that the petitioner  
along with Narendra Kumar and the other co-accused person  
has killed Khusbu Kumari. It is further alleged that the husband  
of the deceased was in love affair with Simpy Kumari and on



account of that the deceased has been done to death by the petitioner and other F.I.R. named accused persons.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent, committed no offence, and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that in fact, the petitioner happens to be brother-in-law of the deceased. It is next submitted that from the contents of the FIR, it appears that no specific allegation has been leveled against the petitioner. He further submits that no cogent material has surfaced during course of investigation against the petitioner. He further submits that due to partition in the family, the petitioner has been living separately from the deceased as well as her husband. Lastly, he submits that the petitioner is a man of clean antecedent and he is languishing in judicial custody since 28.01.2026. Moreover, the police after investigation has submitted charge-sheet in this case. Besides that a co-accused, Simpy Kumari, has already been granted bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 20.08.2026 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 4608 of 2026, which would be evident from Annexure-P/3 to this application and the case of this petitioner stands on better footing. Hence, the petitioner deserves to be enlarged on bail.

5. Learned A.P.P appearing on behalf of the State and



learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant vehemently opposed the prayer for bail application of the petitioner and submitted that the petitioner has actively participated in the in the alleged offence which is heinous in nature, therefore, the petitioner should not be granted bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and also the fact that there is no specific allegation against the petitioner nor any cogent material has surfaced against him during course of investigation as well as the fact that the petitioner bears the clean antecedent coupled with the fact of period of custody, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned A.C.J.M- III, Barh, Patna in connection with Bakhtiyarpur P.S. Case No. 476 of 2025, subject to the following conditions :-

(i) Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court and shall remain physically present as directed by the Court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be canceled by the Court below.

(ii) If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the



witness, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(iii) And, further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedents, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

**(Girijish Kumar, J)**

dhameshwar/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

