

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.91463 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-96 Year-2025 Thana- VISHAMBHARPUR District- Gopalganj

Baliram Singh @ Balram Singh, Son of Late Indrajeet Singh, Resident of Village- Salehpur, P.S.- Vishambharpur, District- Gopalganj, at Present residing at Gangoh Road, Gatta Mill Colony, Near Manak Mau Bijli Ghar, , P.S.-Saharanpur, Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajit Ranjan Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Upendra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 23-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Vishambharpur P.S. Case No. 96 of 2025 registered for the offence under Section 137(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The allegation against the petitioner is that he, along with the apprehended co-accused Sandesh Kumar Singh, has committed the murder of the husband of the informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and his name has surfaced in the confessional statement of co-accused Sandesh Kumar Singh. It has further been submitted that the confessional statement of a



co-accused cannot be taken into account at this stage and despite such a statement, no incriminating material has been recovered against the petitioner. It has next been submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case only because the father of the petitioner, namely, Indrajeet Singh, was shot dead by the deceased and therefore, only on suspicion, the petitioner has been implicated. It has also been submitted that the petitioner resides at Saharanpur and from perusal of the case diary, it would be evident that on 04.05.2025 his location was at Saharanpur. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the state has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and while referring to the case diary, it has been submitted that the tower location of the petitioner was found to be in and around the place of occurrence on the date of occurrence and he had also talked to the apprehended co-accused, Sandesh Kumar Singh, one day prior to the said incident. It has, thus, been submitted that in view of such evidence, the petitioner should not be granted the benefit of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions and taking into account that the petitioner's tower location was also found



in and around the place of occurrence, which also goes on to corroborate with the confessional statement made by the co-accused Sandesh Kumar Singh, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

8. It is made clear that the observation, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

manoj/-

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

