

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.4010 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -58 Year- 2003 Thana -KHAIRA District- JAMUI

=====

Ghanshyam Ravidas, son of Late Bisha Ravidas, resident of Village- Deepa Karhar, P.S. Khaira, Dist Jamui.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajit Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Tapeswar Sharma(App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN SHARMA
ORAL ORDER

2 16-02-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. representing the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Khaira P.S. Case No. 58 of 2003 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 364, 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code and further added Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code.

On the basis of complaint petition of Bhuneshwar Ravidas, this case has been registered against the petitioner and others with allegation that Anil Ravidas, the son of the complainant was coming with the petitioner and others and thereafter he became traceless and it is alleged that Anil Ravidas has been killed and his dead body was also made traceless.

Submission is of false implication and that the



informant is not the eye witness of the alleged occurrence, the petitioner was living in Kolkata right from his student life and he passed secondary examination also from West Bengal Board in 1989 and he was appointed as Assistant Teacher in Adarsh Hindi High School, 34, Upendra Chandra Banerjee Road, Kolkata, where he was living with his wife and he has been arrested in Khaira P.S. Case No. 65 of 2003 and from that case, he has been remanded in this case, on the alleged date also the petitioner was in Kolkata along with his wife, the informant used to demand ransom from petitioner when ever he used to visit his village house, and on his refusal informant implicated the petitioner in false case. It has further been submitted that in this case some other accused persons have faced trial and have already been acquitted and the petitioner is suffering in custody since 21.07.2015, deserves sympathetic consideration.

Learned A.P.P. opposes the prayer of bail by submitting that petitioner remained absconding and chargesheet has been submitted accordingly showing the petitioner absconder and further the petitioner has got criminal antecedent.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, considering that the petitioner remained absconding since long and, as such, at this stage this Court is not inclined to enlarge the

petitioner on bail and accordingly, his such prayer stands rejected.

However, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

sushma/-

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