

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.50518 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-88 Year-2024 Thana- PIPRAKOTHI District- East Champaran

Sunil Singh S/o Late Ramji Singh R/o - Jamuniya, P.S.- Piprakothi, District-
East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Krishna Kant Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pradeep Narain Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 24-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Pipra
Kothi P.S. Case No. 88 of 2024, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 272, 273, 308, 328, 414, 467, 468
and 471 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 30(a) of Bihar
Prohibition and Excise Act, 2022 read with Sections 20(B)ii C,
23(c), 29 of N.D.P.S. Act

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of 5 cases, out of which, 3 cases are
under the Excise Act and petitioner is in custody since
09.04.2026. It is further submitted that Rajesh Singh had
approached this court seeking regular bail by filing Cr. Misc.
No. 47915 of 2024 and the same came to be allowed by an order



dated 20.12.2024. It is further submitted that while granting regular bail to Rajesh Singh, the Court had considered the case on merits and in detail. It is further submitted that name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of Rajesh. It is thus submitted that since Rajesh Singh was granted the privilege of regular bail, hence no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in jail.

4. Learned A.P.P. opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that no doubt name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of Rajesh but then Rajesh was in custody since 27.04.2024 and was granted the privilege of regular bail by an order dated 20.12.2024 i.e. nearly after 8 months of his custody but then petitioner remained illusive and was arrested on 09.04.2026. It is further submitted that if privilege of regular bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and also taking into consideration the submission made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

6. The regular bail application of the petitioner is rejected.



7. However, petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

