

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47991 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-389 Year-2024 Thana- SONEPUR District- Saran

Ranjeet Kumar @ Praduman Son of Rudal Singh Resident of village - Rampur Chandrbhan @ Dagrū, Police Station - Mahnar, District - Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anant Kumar Bhaskar, Advocate Mr. Sanjay Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Mukesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Madan Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

7 08-01-2026 Heard Mr. Anant Kumar Bhaskar, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Madan Kumar, learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Sonapur (Sonpur) P.S. Case No. 389 of 2024 registered for the offence punishable under Section 363 of the Indian Penal Code and later on Sections 302, 120(b), 379 of the Indian Penal Code has also been added.

3. The case of the prosecution in short is that the son of the informant, namely, Raja Kumar (deceased), has gone with his Swift Desire car on booking. When he did not return till 11:15 PM, the informant called her relatives. Raja Kumar (the deceased) also had a mobile. When she called on his mobile, the call was picked up by a girl, and she disclosed that this number does not



belong to the deceased. It is further submitted in the FIR that the deceased was carrying Rs. 60,000/- with him. The case was filed against unknown miscreants.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that during the course of investigation, the spy has disclosed the name of the petitioner. The petitioner has also given his confessional statement. Further, the sister of the petitioner, namely Riya Devi, has given her statement recorded under Section 180 of the BNSS before police.

5. He further submits that the case of the prosecution is based merely on the statement of Riya Devi. Riya Devi, in her statement, has stated that she was having a relationship with the deceased. When the deceased and her husband came to know about this relationship, the petitioner and one Sonu Singh @ Sambhu has killed the deceased. She has further stated that the deceased had gone with Rs. 80,000/-.

6. She has also stated that the calls from the mobile phone of the deceased were forwarded to her mobile phone; however, from her statement, it is clear that she has not seen any occurrence. She has further stated that the killing was an honour killing committed by her brother (the petitioner), as that he



himself had stated that he has killed the deceased to save his prestige in society and threatened her with consequences if she disclosed the same to the police. Save and except the statement of this witness, namely Riya Devi, there is nothing against the petitioner. A report has been called for from the learned trial court, which goes to show that two witnesses have been examined in this case. Moreover, the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 29.12.2024.

7. The application for bail is opposed by the learned counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the period of custody, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The above named petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. ten thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Saran at Chapra in connection with Sonapur (Sonpur) P.S. Case No. 389 of 2024.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

