

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.22675 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -199 Year- 2014 Thana -KASIMBAZAR District- MUNGER

Mukesh Kumar Yadav @ Nata S/o Shanker Yadav resident of Village - Shadipur, Yadav Mohalla P.S. Kotwali, District - Munger.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

with

Criminal Miscellaneous No.22757 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -199 Year- 2014 Thana -KASIMBAZAR District- MUNGER

Rani Devi W/O Pintu Kumar Resident of village- Pakki Gali, Khankah, P.S.- Kasim Bazar, District- Munger

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In Cr.Misc. No.22675 of 2015)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raj Kumar Choudhary

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Parmeshwar Mehta(App)

(In Cr.Misc. No.22757 of 2015)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raj Kumar Choudhary

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Parmeshwar Mehta(App)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 09-10-2015 Heard Sri Raj Kumar Choudhary, learned counsel for
the petitioners and Sri Parmeshwar Mehta, learned A.P.P.

Since in both the bail petitions petitioners are in
custody in connection with Kasim Bazar P.S. Case No. 199 of

2014, both the cases were heard together and are being disposed of by this common order.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that from the F.I.R. itself it is evident that F.I.R. was lodged on the fardbyan of Rani Devi, who is petitioner in Cr. Misc. No. 22757 of 2015. As per F.I.R. the petitioner Rani Devi had not identified the person who had given gun shot injury on her husband. She had given description of the accused person. However, subsequently, on suspicion only, the informant of the present case namely, Rani Devi has been implicated as accused and a case has been made out that petitioner Rani Devi in connivance with Mukesh Kumar Yadav @ Nata, who is petitioner in Cr. Misc. No. 22675 of 2015 have killed Pintu Modi, husband of the petitioner Rani Devi. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that save and except suspicion there is nothing in the case diary. He further submits that the so- called mobile, which has been referred in the case diary was also not of the petitioner Mukesh Kumar Yadav @ Nata, but it was lying in the name of one another person. On the aforesaid grounds a prayer has been made for extending the privilege of bail.

Sri Mehta, learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail.

Besides hearing the parties, I have also perused the case diary and on perusal of the case diary, I am of the view that it is not a case for extending the privilege of bail.

Both the bail petitions stand dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

Praful/-

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