

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.47017 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -141 Year- 2015 Thana -PANDAU District- MADHUBANI

=====

1. Ramanand Jha @ Raman Jha Son of late Haleshwar Jha Resident of
Village- Hanuman Nagar P.s Pandaul District Madhubani.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ishtiyaque Ahmad

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Asha Devi(App)

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

4 12-01-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. representing the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Pandaul
P.S. Case No. 141 of 2015 registered for the offence punishable
under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegedly the petitioner earlier has caused threat to kill
the son of the informant who was working as electrician and on
the day of occurrence Jagatnand Pathak, the son of the informant
was asked to climb on pole under conspiracy and at that time there
was shut down but the electric current was switched on by the
petitioner resulting Jagatnand Pathak received electric shock and
was burnt and fell down and during the way to hospital, he died.

Submission is of false implication and that the



deceased and the petitioner were working separately, the deceased was doing nefarious activity without shut down he was doing the work resulting he received electric shot and was injured seriously. During investigation, the witnesses have stated that the petitioner tried his best to save the life of the deceased as the petitioner with help of other brought him for treatment and this is evident from paras 18 and 19 of the case diary and further witnesses vide para 23, 24 and 25 have also stated that the petitioner brought the injured for treatment by auto but he was declared dead. In para 36 of the case diary it has come that the deceased had not taken shut down and without taking shut shown he climbed on the electric pole at his own risk and, as such, the petitioner who is suffering in custody since 12.07.2015, deserves sympathetic consideration as chargesheet has already been submitted and there is no chance of tampering with the prosecution evidence

The learned A.P.P. opposes the prayer of bail.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, considering that chargesheet has already been submitted and there is no chance of tampering with the prosecution evidence and, as such, the petitioner, above named, is directed to be released on bail on execution of bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the

Learned C.J.M., Madhubani arising out of Pandaul P.S. Case No. 141 of 2015 subject to the conditions that one of the bailors must be near relative and another having sufficient immovable property within the territorial jurisdiction of the court concerned and the petitioner shall remain present on each and every date during trial and the default on two consecutive dates on his part without any reason shall disentitle the petitioner from privilege of bail.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

sushma/-

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