

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.489 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-258 Year-2025 Thana- SITAMARHI District- Sitamarhi

Prince Kumar S/O Ramsevak Singh R/O Village- Dhobagawa, P.S- Pusha,
Distt.- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Ankit Kumar Jha, Advocate Mr. Rabi Bhushan, Advocate Mr. Rakhi Kumari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Ms.Pronoti Singh, APP Mr. Krishna Murari, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

4 01-04-2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Sitamarhi P.S. Case no.258 of 2025, registered under sections 103(1) and 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that she received information about murder of her husband. On reaching home, she found the dead body of her husband and the petitioner by her side. It is further stated that the petitioner accepted having murdered the informant's husband. Information was given to the police.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. The manner of occurrence is other than what has been described in the FIR.



There was no reason for the petitioner to have committed the said crime. It is not a natural conduct for a person to have confessed the crime in the manner as has been described by the informant in the FIR. The petitioner is in custody since 1.4.2025 i.e. for 1 year and undertakes to cooperate in the investigation/trial.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant. Learned counsel for the informant submits that the petitioner is named in the FIR and there is direct allegation against him insofar as he confessed to have committed the alleged crime and of having murdered the husband of the informant.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegation against the petitioner in the FIR and the material that has transpired in course of investigation, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.

7. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail after 3 months or on framing of charge, whichever is later.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Shiv/-

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

