

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86927 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-84 Year-2024 Thana- BRAHMPURA District- Muzaffarpur

Amresh Singh @ Amresh Chandravansi S/o Madan Singh @ Madan Chandravansi R/o Village- Holding No.965, Krishna Toli, Jhitkiya, Ward No.2, North of Pathak Colony, M.I.T Brahampur, P.O- M.I.T., Barhanpura, P.S- Brahampura, Dist- Muzaffarpur, Pin Code- 842001 (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhishek, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anish Chandra, A.P.P

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 25-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Sessions Trial No. 648 of 2024 arising out of Brahampura P.S. Case No. 84 of 2024 lodged on 02.04.2024, for the offence punishable under Sections 498-A, 494, 302 & 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the bail application of the petitioner was earlier rejected *vide* order dated 14.11.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 61624 of 2024. Counsel submits that admittedly, this case has been lodged



under sections 498-A, 494, 302 & 34 of the IPC. But, he submits that on the earlier occasion and on this occasion, it is his specific case that on the date of alleged occurrence, the petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence, rather, he was present at other place and in this regard, he possesses a C.C.T.V. footage with certificate under section 65(B) of the Indian Evidence Act. Counsel submits that the bail application of the petitioner was earlier rejected only due to the reason that he is the husband of the deceased. Counsel also submits that the petitioner is in custody since 03.04.2024, having clean antecedent. Counsel further submits that charge has already been framed and other persons have been granted bail. Counsel also submits that the allegation of section 494 of the IPC upon the petitioner is not correct. Counsel further submits that the petitioner is ready to fulfill all the conditions whatsoever shall be imposed upon him.

4. Learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that it is the petitioner who is responsible for the death of the victim. He submits that according to his information, charge has been framed and prosecution evidence is going on.

5. Learned APP for the State also opposes the prayer



for bail of the petitioner and submits that on previous occasion, report with regard to the present stage of the trial was called for, and from the said report, it transpires that out of 13 witnesses, only six witnesses have been examined and seven witnesses are yet to be examined.

6. In the present facts and circumstances of this case, let the above named petitioner be granted bail, on furnishing bail bond of Rs.30,000/- (Rupees Thirty Thousand) as mentioned in Section 2(1)(d) of the B.N.S.S., 2023 to the satisfaction of District & Additional Sessions Judge-XI, Muzaffarpur in connection with Sessions Trial No. 648 of 2024 arising out of Brahampura P.S. Case No. 84 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down U/s 480(3) of the B.N.S.S., 2023 with the following further conditions:-

I. one of the bailor should be the family member of the petitioner who shall provide official document to show his *bona fide*;

II. the petitioner shall appear before the Trial Court on each and every scheduled date, and failure to do so for three consecutive dates without any plausible reason/explanation shall be resulted into cancellation of his bail bonds by the Trial Court itself;



III. the petitioner shall appear before the concerned police station for two years, within every fortnight, to mark his attendance.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

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

