

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74806 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-10 Year-2020 Thana- HARNAUT District- Nalanda

Surya Prakash S/o Bablu Kumar @ Padri Singh R/o Village- Pandark,
Surajpur Tola, P.S.- Pandarak, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajive Ranjan Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 26-02-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Harnaut PS Case No. 10 of 2020 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 302, 120B and 34 of IPC and Section
27 of Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has antecedent of four cases and is in custody since
19-8-2025. It is next submitted that the informant alleges that
on 10-1-2020 at about 1:15 pm, while he was near the cement
godown, when two accused on a motorcycle came and
indiscriminately fired killing his son Gautam.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is not named in the FIR and his name transpired



during the course of investigation in the confessional statement of Dheeraj, who disclosed that this petitioner was also involved in killing the deceased by resorting to firing. It is next submitted that confessional statement of an accused in police custody does not have any evidentiary value. It is further submitted that Dheeraj has already been granted the privilege of regular bail by this Court. It is thus submitted that the person in whose confession the name of the petitioner transpired has been granted the privilege of regular bail as such petitioner be also extended the same benefit.

5. Learned A.P.P., Sri Chandra Bhushan Prasad, for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that son of the informant died and the informant has not named the petitioner in the FIR, which amply demonstrates that informant had no intention of implicating the petitioner, but then his name transpired in the confessional statement of co-accused during the course of investigation. It is also submitted that petitioner has antecedent of four serious cases and in the event if privilege of regular bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties,



the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

