IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60863 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010829362026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-316 Year-2026 Thana- SAHEBGANJ District- Muzaffarpur

==========

Sumant Kumar @ Sumanth Kumar Son of Santosh Persad Resident of Village- Bijdhari, P.S.- Kesarai, District- East Champaran

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 70101 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010829362026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-316 Year-2026 Thana- SAHEBGANJ District- Muzaffarpur

==========

Sohit Kumar Son of Santosh Prasad R/O - Vill - Bijdhari, Ward No 8, Ps -Kesariya, District -East Champaran

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 60863 of 2026)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Balgovind Sharma, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Narendra Kumar Singh, A.P.P
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 70101 of 2026)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nafisuzzoha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Uday Chand Prasad, A.P.P

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

4 27-10-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. Both the aforesaid applications arise in connection with Sahebganj P.S. Case No. 316 of 2026 lodged on 17.04.2026, for the offences punishable under Sections 137(2),

WEB COPY

140(1) and 3(5) of B.N.S, 2023, Later on Section 103(1), pending in the Court of learned C.J.M, Muzaffarpur. Therefore, both the aforesaid applications have been heard together and are being disposed of by this common order.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the informant brothers opposed her marriage to Sunil Kumar. It is alleged that on April 15, 2026, the informant's brothers called Sunil to meet him, after which Sunil disappeared and his phone was switched off. It is further alleged that on April 17, 2026, Sunil's abandoned scooter was recovered beneath Chaukidariya Bridge in East Champaran, leading Shilpi to suspect he was abducted with the intention of being murdered by her brothers and their accomplices.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case merely on suspicion. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the petitioners have clean antecedents. The learned counsel also submits that the petitioner in Cr. Misc. 60863 of 2026 is in custody since 21.04.2026 and the petitioner in Cr. Misc. 70101 of 2026 is in custody since 30.06.2026. The counsel lastly submits that there is no eyewitness to the alleged occurrence.

WEB COPY

5. The learned APP for the State vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners.

6. Having heard the parties and perused the case-diary along with the post mortem report this Court takes note of the gravity of the offence involving a heinous charge of murder, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at this stage.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for regular bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected.

(Alok Kumar, J)

smriti/-

U		T	

WEB COPY