

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.213 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-75 Year-2024 Thana- MASAUDHI District- Patna

=====

Amlesh Kumar @ Karan Kumar, Son of Birju Yadav, Resident of Village-
Lakhapur, P.S.- Parsbigha, District- Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Birendra Kumar, Adv. Mr. Rajiv Ranjan Singh, Adv. Ms. Meena Kumari, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :		Ms. Meena Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 18-03-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. This is second attempt on behalf of the petitioner
for grant of bail. Earlier his application for bail was rejected by
this Court *vide* order dated 12.05.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No.
86547 of 2024.

3. The petitioner, who is in custody, seeks bail in
connection with Sessions Trial No. 721 of 2024 arising out of
Masaurhi P.S. Case No. 75 of 2024 registered for the offence(s)
punishable under Section(s) 363 and 365 of the Indian Penal
Code and later on, Section(s) 302, 201, 120(B) and 34 of the



I.P.C. were also added.

4. The allegation against the petitioner is that he had called the informant's son from the house and had taken him away at the instance of paying Rs. 8,000/-, which was due to him and, thereafter, committed the murder of the son of the informant.

5. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that though he has been named in the F.I.R., but the story propounded against him that he had called the informant's son is false and concocted. It has further been submitted that no occurrence, as alleged, had ever taken place as the petitioner used to work at Hyderabad in connection with his livelihood and there is no dispute between the petitioner and the deceased as alleged by the prosecution. It has next been submitted that the petitioner had willfully surrendered before the police when he came to know about his impleadment in the present case and he was beaten by the police and was forced to sign on a blank sheet of paper on which his confessional statement is stated to have been recorded. It has also been submitted that the trial has already begun and three witnesses have already been examined. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioner carries no criminal antecedent and he is in custody since 05.02.2024.



6. The learned Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that on the confessional statement of the petitioner, the dead-body of the deceased was recovered. It has been submitted that the petitioner is named in the F.I.R. and there is ample material against him collected during the course of investigation, showing his involvement in the present case and moreover from the report received from the Trial Court, three witnesses have been examined.

7. Regard being had to the facts and circumstances of the case and finding no new grounds, this Court is not inclined to grant the petitioner the privilege of regular bail.

8. The prayer for bail is, accordingly, rejected.

9. The application stands dismissed.

10. It is, however, observed that the Trial Court shall conclude the trial expeditiously, preferably within a year.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Praveen-II/-

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

