

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.14935 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -225 Year- 2015 Thana -LAXMIPUR District- JAMUI

=====

1.Shankar Ravidas
2. Ganesh Ravidas @ Ganesh Das
Both sons of Kaleshwar Ravidas
3. Sabitri Devi, w/o Shankar Ravidas
4. Malti Devi, w/o Anil Das
5. Pappu Das @ Pappu Ravidas @ Pappu Kumar, s/o Shankar Ravidas
All are r/v-Sewa, P.S. – Gidhaur, Distt - Jamui

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arjun Pd. Keshri, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sadanand Paswan(App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR
JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 28-06-2016 Heard both sides.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in Lakshmipur (Giddhaur) P.S. Case No. 225/2015, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 302, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3(i)(x) of S.C./S.T. Act.

Chameli Devi the mother of the deceased alleged that Pintu Yadav took her son, but her son did not return. On the next day dead body of her son was recovered.

It is submitted that the petitioners are not named in the F.I.R. Nothing has been recovered from the possession of the petitioners. Name of the petitioners has come up in the case during

the course of investigation in the confessional statement of co-accused. It appears during the course of investigation that the mobile of the deceased was recovered from the possession of Lua Yadav. It transpired that from mobile of Gungari Devi who is lover of Lua Yadav, call was made to the mobile of the deceased. Lua Yadav and Gungari Devi also confessed and disclosed that they killed the deceased Mintu Kumar Razak with the help of the petitioners because he had love affairs with the daughter of her sister and threw the dead body near Chhoti Pahari.

It appears that of course nothing has been recovered from the possession of the petitioners, but from the possession of co-accused mobile of the deceased was recovered and the accused persons confessed their guilt disclosing the involvement of the petitioners above-named.

Considering the facts aforesaid, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners above-named on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J.)

Vinita/-

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