

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.4742 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-313 Year-2025 Thana- MUFFASIL District- West Champaran

Sikari @ Amar Yadav S/o- Late Bhola Yadav R/o- Parwativa Tola, PS- Bettiah Mufassil, District- West Champaran

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Jitan Ram S/o- Late Ramdev Ram R/v- Barwat Sena Ps- Bettiah Muffasil Dist- West Champaran

... .. Respondent/s

with

CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No. 3838 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-313 Year-2025 Thana- MUFFASIL District- West Champaran

Monu Kumar @ Manu Kumar S/o- Sri Lalbabu Yadav @ Lalbahadur Yadav R/o- Parbatiya Tola Ps- Bettiah Muffasil Dist- West Champaran

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Jitan Ram S/o- Late Ramdeo Ram R/o- Barwat Sena Ps- Bettiah Muffasil Dist- West Champaran

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No. 4742 of 2025)

For the Appellant/s : Mr.Dhananjay Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr.Usha Kumari 1

(In CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No. 3838 of 2025)

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Umesh Chandra Verma

Mr. Sharad Kumar Verma

Mr.Sagar Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr.Usha Kumari 1

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

6 01-07-2026

Re:-Criminal Appeal (SJ) No. 4742 of 2025.

Heard the parties.

2. This appeal has been filed against the order dated
14.10.2025 passed by the learned District and Additional
Sessions Judge First, cum-Special Judge(SC/ST), West



Champaran at Bettiah by which the regular bail application of the appellant has been rejected in connection with Bettiah Muffasil P.S. Case No. 313 of 2025 registered for the offence under Sections 190, 191(1), 191(2), 126(2), 118, 103(1) of the BNS and under Sections 3(1)(r)(s), 3(2)(v) of the SC/ST Prevention of Atrocities Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the deceased was killed brutally by the accused persons by stabbing, which caused three puncture wound on the body of the deceased.

4. The appellant is in custody since 14.08.2025.

5. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and he has played no role in the killing of the deceased. He further submits that the appellant is not named in the FIR and no material has come against him to connect him with the alleged offence.

6. Learned Spl. P.P. for the State has opposed the application of the appellant.

7. I have gone through the records of the case including the case diary.

8. From the records, it appears that one Ravindra Kumar Singh, who was the owner of Bagicha Restaurant, had planned the murder of the deceased because of some land



dispute for which a title suit was decided in favour of the deceased 20 days before the date of occurrence. Ravindra Kumar Singh has planned the murder of the deceased with other criminals including the appellant and he has also given his self-inculpatory statement regarding the same. The appellant has talked to Ravindra Kumar Singh on his mobile 38 times around the dates of the commission of crime.

9. Considering the aforesaid facts, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the appellant.

10. Accordingly, this appeal stands dismissed.

Re:-Criminal Appeal (SJ) No. 3838 of 2025.

11. Heard the parties.

12. This appeal has been filed against the order dated 19.08.2025 passed by the learned District and Additional Sessions Judge First, cum-Special Judge(SC/ST), West Champaran at Bettiah by which the regular bail application of the appellant has been rejected in connection with Bettiah Muffasil P.S. Case No. 313 of 2025 registered for the offence under Sections 190, 191(1), 191(2), 126(2), 118, 103(1) of the BNS and under Sections 3(1)(r)(s), 3(2)(v) of the SC/ST Prevention of Atrocities Act.

13. As per the prosecution case, the deceased was



killed brutally by the accused persons by stabbing, which caused three puncture wound on the body of the deceased.

14. The appellant is in custody since 07.06.2025.

15. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and he has played no role in the killing of the deceased. He further submits that the appellant is not named in the FIR and no material has come against him to connect him with the alleged offence.

16. Learned Spl. P.P. for the State has opposed the application of the appellant.

17. I have gone through the records of the case including the case diary.

18. From the records, it appears that the appellant has actively participated in the killing of the deceased and his role was to help the killers in fleeing away after committing the crime. Akhilesh, Dhoni and Dinesh assaulted the victim and thereafter they fled with the appellant on motorcycle.

19. Considering the aforesaid facts, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the appellant.

20. Accordingly, this appeal stands dismissed.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Vikas/-

U			
---	--	--	--

