

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.4493 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-203 Year-2025 Thana- RAGHOPUR District- Vaishali

Chandan Kumar Son of Ram Prakash Singh R/o Village - Raghapur, P.S. -
Jurawanpur, Dist. - Vaishali at Hajipur.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar Roy, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sadanand Paswan, SPP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

4 05-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned
Special Public Prosecutor for the State and perused the case
diary.

2. The instant appeal has been filed by the appellant
against the order dated 27.09.2025 passed by learned Exclusive
Special Judge Sc/ST Act, Vaishali at Hajipur whereby the prayer
for bail of the appellant in connection with Raghapur P.S. Case
No. 203 of 2025 under Sections 140(1), 3(5) of the Bharatiya
Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 3(2)(v) of SC/ST Act was
rejected.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that while the husband
of the informant was resting under a tree near the Block Office,
he was run over by a white vehicle, and the driver along with
two others took him away with an intention to kill him.



4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. Learned counsel for the appellant also submitted that the appellant is not named in the FIR. Name of the appellant has transpired in this case on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused, namely, Kiran Devi and the same has got no evidentiary value. Learned counsel for the appellant further submitted that the appellant has not taken the caste name of the informant in public view. Hence, no offence under the provisions of SC/ST Act is made out against him. The appellant has no intention to disgrace the image of the informant in public view. The appellant is in custody since 02.09.2025 and has got no criminal antecedent. Other co-accused has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 16.10.2025 passed in Cr. Appeal (S.J.) No. 3540 of 2025.

5. Learned Special P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the appellant and submitted that there is specific allegation against the appellant. It is further submitted that during investigation, confessional statement of the appellant was recorded in which he categorically stated that he along with other co-accused persons



disposed of the body of the victim with the intention of hiding or destroying the evidence. The police has also recovered the car on the basis of confessional statement of the appellant. Hence, the appellant does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, specific allegation as also nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the appellant at this juncture.

7. Accordingly, the appeal stands dismissed. The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial expeditiously.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

