IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74339 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC011050652026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-27 Year-2006 Thana- DIDARGANJ District- Patna

==========

Jafar Ali @ Jafar Khan Son of Shim Miya Resident of Village- Amodhi Ward No.3, PS.- Amodhi, District- East Champaran

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajeev Ranjan
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

2 04-11-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 412, 414, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is aged about 70 years, it is further submitted that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case based on confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody who disclosed that they along with the petitioner killed the driver of the truck and looted the truck along with the articles, it is next submitted that confessional statement in

WEB COPY

police custody does not have any evidentiary value in the eye of law.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that no doubt the petitioner as of date is aged about 70 years and is a person with clean antecedent but then the case is of the year 2006 and the apprehended accused in their confessional statement have disclosed the name of the petitioner of committing a heinous offence, it is fairly submitted that confessional statement in police custody does not have any evidentiary value in the eye of law but then the confessional statement requires to be corroborated for which interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submission made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikram/-

U		T	

WEB COPY