

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.46883 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-641 Year-2025 Thana- RAHUI District- Nalanda

Saryug Paswan Son of Late Jatri Paswan R/O Village- Mora Talab, P.S.-
Bhaganbigha, Distt.- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Tej Narayan Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Zainul Abedin, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 21-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Rahui(Bhaganbigha) P.S. Case No. 641 of 2025 instituted for
the offences under Sections 126(2), 117(2), 109(1), 103(1), 3(5)
of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that the named accused
persons, including the petitioner, allegedly assaulted the
informant's husband with iron rods and lathis during a quarrel,
causing injuries to which he succumbed during treatment.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the



petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that general and omnibus allegation has been made against the petitioner. No specific allegation has been alleged against the petitioner. He further submitted that the informant has not assigned any reason or motive of the alleged occurrence, which creates doubt over the prosecution case. He further submitted that both parties are agnates. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 16.11.2025 and has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner stating that there is allegation against the petitioner that he along with other co-accused persons beaten the informant's husband to death. He further submitted that the allegation is further supported by the post-mortem report of the deceased. Learned APP, further referring to the impugned order submitted that several witnesses in paragraph nos. 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 have supported the prosecution case. Learned APP, therefore, submitted that petitioner does not deserve to be released on bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as also the allegation against the petitioner being



corroborated by the medical evidence, 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.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

