

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35270 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-38 Year-2024 Thana- PHENHARA District- East Champaran

Navin Ram @ Navin Kumar Son of Jagarnath Ram Resident of Village-
Rupoliya Tola Virta, P.S.- Phenhara, District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prateek Tandon, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 21-07-2026 Heard Learned Counsel for the petitioner and
Learned APP for the State.

2. The present criminal miscellaneous application has been filed under Sections 483 and 484 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as ‘the BNSS, 2023’) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner who is in custody in connection with S.Tr. No. 553 of 2024, arising out of Phenhara P.S. Case No.38 of 2024, lodged on 02/03/2024, under Sections 302/120(B)/ 34 of the IPC pending in the Court of 14th Additional District and Sessions Judge, East Champaran at Motihari.

3. As per the prosecution, FIR has been lodged against 14 named accused persons including the present petitioner with allegation on the basis of suspicion that the son of the informant



was killed by all the accused persons in connivance with each other.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. Counsel submits that FIR has been lodged absolutely on the basis of suspicion and there is no material against the present petitioner. He submits that petitioner is in custody since 04.03.2024 having clean antecedent. Counsel submits that in the rejection order the only material has come against the petitioner is that the deceased used to put bad eyes on the sister of the petitioner and this is the reason due to which the occurrence took place. Counsel submits that the petitioner is not a criminal and only on suspicion he is in custody. Counsel submits that the case diary was called for and in the case diary there is no material has come against the petitioner.

5. Learned APP for the State, on the other hand, opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that in the case diary the confession of the petitioner in Para-24 has been alleged that he along with others killed the son of the informant and taken mobile, rupees fifteen thousand cash and gold chain. He further submits that in Para-27 it has come that at the time of arrest the mobile has been recovered from his



possession.

6. As such, this Court finds that this is not only the case of confession but corroboration also.

7. In this view of the matter, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Hence, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby refused.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Mkr./Anshuman/

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

