

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.39445 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -90 Year- 1996 Thana -HISUA District- NAWADA

=====

Rajkumar Manjhi, son of Jagdish Manjhi, resident of village-Pachadha,
P.S.-Hisua, District- Nawada.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sheo Kumar Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Dr. Ravindra Kumar (App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AMARESH KUMAR LAL
ORAL ORDER

5 02-03-2015 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the

learned counsel for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in Hisua P.S. Case No.90 of
1996 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 366
and 376 of the Indian Penal Code.

The allegation against the petitioner is to have
committed rape of the complainant/informant.

It is submitted that the petitioner has been falsely
implicated in this case. There was love affair between the
petitioner and the complainant/informant. Moreover, the case
has been compromised between both the parties and the co-
accused Ramkali Devi and Jagdish Manjhi have been granted
bail vide Cr. Misc. No.18311/2014.

The learned counsel for the State submits that there

is specific allegation of overt act against the petitioner. The co-accused Ramkali Devi and Jagdish Manjhi are the parents of the petitioner and there is no allegation of rape against them. The case is not compoundable.

It also appears from the report submitted by the learned trial court that if both the parties cooperate with the trial, the case can be disposed of within four months.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in my opinion, the petitioner does not deserve bail. His prayer is rejected.

(Amaresh Kumar Lal, J)

V.K. Pandey/-

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