

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.87856 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-379 Year-2025 Thana- BIHAR District- Nalanda

Amit Kumar S/O Suresh Das Resident of village- Toygarh, P.S.- Barbigha,
District- Sheikhpura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Anirudh Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Sanjay Kumar Pandey, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Gopal Jha, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

5 01-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for regular bail in a case registered for the offence punishable under sections 103 (1), 238 (b) and 3 (5) of the BNS.

3. The case of the prosecution is that daughter of the informant, who was pursuing a GNM course went missing. It is alleged that the petitioner was also pursuing the same course is involved in her murder. The informant suspects that the petitioner had killed her. During the Course of investigation, the petitioner is said to have made a confessional statement and on the basis of such confessional statement, the dead body of the girl along with incriminating articles were recovered.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in connection with the present case. It is further submitted that save and except the confessional statement of his own, there is nothing against him. It is also contended that the confessional statement made before the police has no evidentiary value in the eye of law. Moreover, the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 19.06.2025 having no criminal antecedent.

5. In this case, it is however apparent that pursuant to the confessional statement of the petitioner, the dead body of the girl and other incriminating materials including blood stained clothes were recovered. Thus, the confessional statement to the extent it led to the recovery is admissible evidence.

6. Learned APP appearing for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer of regular bail.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and the nature of allegation made against the petitioner, I am not inclined to extend him the privilege of bail which is accordingly **rejected.**

8. However, the petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after six months, if the trial is not concluded



within the said period.

9. Further, the learned trial Court is hereby directed to make all possible endeavors to expedite the trial and conclude the same at the earliest.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Jagdish/-

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

