

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.10850 of 2016

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

=====

1. Puna Manjhi son of Saryu 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. Madan Jeet Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md.Arif(App)

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN
SHARMA**

ORAL ORDER

3 27-04-2016 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 F.I.R. named
accused persons forcibly dragged Sonmati 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. 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 the confessional statement there is no specific allegation against the petitioner, nothing has been recovered from possession of the petitioner and, as such, the petitioner suffering in custody since 22.12.2015, 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 has 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 at this stage and accordingly, his such prayer stands rejected.

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

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

sushma/-

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