

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44301 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-200 Year-2025 Thana- IMAMGANJ District- Gaya

-
1. CHOTTU DAS @ SUVINDRA KUMAR RAVI S/O PHAGUNI DAS R/O VILL.- CHOTKA KARASAN, P.S.- IMAMGANJ, DISTRICT- GAYA
 2. SAMINDRA KUMAR @ SURENDRA BHARTI S/O GULAB BHUIYA R/O VILL.- CHOTKA KARASAN, P.S.- IMAMGANJ, DISTRICT- GAYA
 3. AKHILESH KUMAR S/O MUKHU YADAV R/O VILL.- CHOTKA KARASAN, P.S.- IMAMGANJ, DISTRICT- GAYA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nafisu Zzoha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shantanu Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 20-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner no. 1 and 2 are persons with clean antecedent and petitioner no. 3 has antecedent of one case under the Excise Act and the informant alleges that his son Kishori along with Barhan, Jagmohan, Surendra, Yogendra, Teni and Lattu worked in a liquor kiln it is next alleged that on 23.06.2025 he met his son and asked him to leave the work but he did not listen, next alleges that on 26.06.2025 an unknown person came and informed that his son's dead body is thrown near a jungle,



accordingly, the informant went to the place of occurrence but he did not find the dead body of his son, thereafter went to the liquor kiln but no one was present, it is next alleged that on 27.06.2025 he was informed that his son's dead body was thrown near a bridge stacked in a sack accordingly he reached the place of occurrence and saw police had arrived and the dead body of his son was recovered whom the informant identified thus alleges based on suspicion that the aforesaid named accused persons killed his son on account of dispute relating to sharing of property.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are not named in the FIR and their name transpired in the confessional statement of Teni, Barhan and Surendra, it is further submitted that confessional statement in police custody does not have any evidentiary value it is next submitted that Yogendra Bhuiyan had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Criminal Miscellaneous No. 37821 of 2026 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 25.06.2026 passed by a learned Coordinate Bench as such based on parity the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners seeks anticipatory bail for the petitioners.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes



the anticipatory bail application of the petitioners and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that dead body of the son of the informant was found stacked in a sack thrown near a bridge. It is further submitted that informant was not even aware of the petitioners herein as such he had not named them in the FIR which amply demonstrates that informant never intended to implicate someone falsely in the case but then name of the petitioners transpired based on the confessional statement of apprehended accuses who are named in the FIR based on suspicion, it is next submitted that while granting the privilege of anticipatory bail to Yogendra Bhuiyan the Hon'ble Court did not take these facts into consideration, it is next submitted that since this is a case of murder hence the case requires to be investigated.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioners on bail.

6. Hence, the prayer for bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikram/-

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

