

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.5315 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -133 Year- 2015 Thana -KARPI District- JEHANABAD

=====

Sirchand Manjhi @ Sirchan Manjhi @ Sichan Manjhi son of Sri Dukhan Manjhi resident of village - Azad Nagar, P.S. - Karpi, District - Arwal.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Murari Prasad Sinha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Smt. Renu Kumari(App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN SHARMA
ORAL ORDER

4 31-03-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. representing the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Karpi P.S. Case No. 133 of 2015 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 302 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegedly, the petitioner and other eight FIR named accused persons forcibly dragged Sonamati Devi, the mother of the informant, from her house and took away towards Payne (east) to the village and when the informant tried to rescue her, they ran to kill the informant also and it is alleged that they have killed the mother of the informant and hide the dead body. The motive behind the occurrence is that the accused persons were claiming the mother of the informant as *Dayan*.

Submission is of false implication and that against the petitioner there is no specific allegation, the allegations are general and omnibus in nature, in confessional statement of co-accused as well as of the petitioner also no specific allegation has been attributed against the petitioner, nothing has been recovered from possession of the petitioner and, as such, the petitioner suffering in custody since 08.08.2015, deserves sympathetic consideration to which the learned A.P.P. opposes by submitting that on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused Amresh Manjhi, some parts of the dead body were recovered and further on the basis of confessional statement of other co-accused, arms used in committing the crime, have also been recovered.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, considering the allegation attributed against the petitioner, serious in nature, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and accordingly, his such prayer stands rejected.

However, the petitioners may be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after remaining one year in custody.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

sushma/-

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