

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.91482 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-14 Year-2025 Thana- Rajeshwari District- Supaul

Ritesh Kumar Yadav @ Riteh Kumar Son of Upendra Yadav Resident of
Village- Ratansar Ward No. 06, P.S.- Rajeshwari, District- Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arvind Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Raj Kishor Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

5 06-04-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned APP for the State.

2. This is the 2nd attempt of the petitioner seeking bail
in connection with Rajeshwari P.S. Case No. 14 of 2025
registered for the offence under Sections 103(1) and 3(5) of the
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner was
rejected on 18.08.2025 in Cr. Misc. No. 49171 of 2025 which
reads as follows:-

*Heard learned counsel for the
petitioner and learned APP for the State.*

*2. The petitioner has preferred this
application for grant of regular bail in
connection with Rajeshwari P.S. Case No. 14 of
2025 dated registered for the offences
punishable u/ss 103(1) read with Section 3(5) of
the B.N.S.*



3. As per the prosecution case, the informant alleged that there was enmity between his son, Ravi Kumar and the coaccused, Sanjay Mandal, Anmol Yadav and Shalen Yadav over monetary transactions. The above named accused persons threatened the informant's son to kidnap and kill him. It is further alleged that the informant's son had given money to the coaccused, Anmol Yadav but he did not return the same and in this regard, the accused persons were threatening the informant's son. On 24.01.2025, the informant's son went to sleep on the verandah of his door and after that the informant's wife woke up at 1.00 A.M. and went to check on the cattle and saw that her son's mouth was stuffed with a muffler and his muffler was tied around his neck and he was hanging in the barn of the house. Thereafter, the informant's wife started crying then the informant went there and saw that his son Ravi Kumar was dead.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. The name of the petitioner has surfaced in this case during the course of investigation. It is further submitted that the petitioner is the full brother of the deceased and the son of the informant and there was no dispute between the petitioner and the deceased. It is further submitted that the F.I.R. has been lodged by the informant alleging therein that there was some previous enmity between the deceased and the F.I.R. named accused persons. It is further submitted that the specific allegation of commission of murder of the informant's son is against the F.I.R. named accused persons and the petitioner has no concern with the alleged offence. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The petitioner is in custody since 04.03.2025.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has



opposed the bail petition of the petitioner and submitted that during the course of investigation, as per para 109, 147 and 163 of the case diary in which the deceased had illicit relationship with his sister-in-law (bhabhi) who is the wife of the petitioner due to which there were often used to occur scuffle between the deceased and the petitioner on the issue of illicit relationship. It is further submitted that due to alleged illicit relationship, the petitioner with his associates killed the deceased which is evident during the course of investigation. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner confessed his guilt in the alleged crime as stated in para 166 of the case diary.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the heinous nature of allegation against the petitioner, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above-named on bail.

7. The application stands rejected.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that out of twelve witnesses, six witnesses have been examined.

5. Considering the fact that the trial is progressing and the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***X vs. State of Rajasthan & Anr, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3539***, I am not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this application for regular bail stands rejected.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Shishir/-

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

