

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4323 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-899 Year-2024 Thana- MANER District- Patna

Jay Prakash Paswan @ Prakash Paswan S/o Sri Bhushan Paswan R/v-
Gyashpur, P.S.- Manner, Distt.- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vijay Kumar Sinha
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Mohammad Sufyan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 03-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well
as learned APP for the State.

2. In this case, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in connection with Manner P.S. Case No. 899 of 2024, Sessions Trial No. 1457 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103, 3(5) of the BNS and Sections 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 27.12.2024, the informant who is Khadim at Maner Patna lodged a written complaint before the SHO Maner P.S. Patna stating that his wife at 04:30 PM informed him that his son has got electrocuted and was admitted by Jay Prakash Paswan (petitioner) in hospital at Maner. When the informant reached the Primary Health Centre, Maner, the informant did not find his



son there, but his wife met in the way who said that his son was admitted at private clinic of one Dr. Lalit Mohan. The informant reached there but he was told that his son had been admitted at NSMCH, Bihta where his son was declared as dead. The police was informed and on enquiry, the informant got knowledge that the petitioner Jay Prakash Paswan, Kunal, son and grandson of Baldeo Ram as well as 3-4 other persons left the hospital after the death of the informant's son and it has been further alleged that one of the said persons had shot the informant's son.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated. The petitioner was not arrested on the spot. There is no evidence against him. Moreover, the petitioner carried the deceased to the hospital.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail.

6. Earlier also, the petitioner had approached this Court for grant of bail vide Criminal Miscellaneous No. 39699 of 2025, which was rejected by order dated 13.08.2025, because the petitioner had given a false declaration/disclosure about his criminal antecedents as well as for the reason that in the confessional statement made during police custody, the



petitioner had accepted his involvement in the murder of the informant's son. Therefore, taking into account the gravity of the offence alleged, the bail had been rejected. There is no changed circumstance for grant of bail and therefore, the bail application is once again rejected.

7. However, the petitioner, if so advised, may renew his prayer for bail after six months.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

kundan/-

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

