

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10246 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-87 Year-2018 Thana- SULTANGANJ District- Patna

MUNNA RAM @ MUNNA DOM (Male), aged about 32 years, Son of
Bajrangi Ram @ Bajrangi Dom, Resident of Mohalla - Mushllahpur,
Domkhana, P.S. Sultanganj Dist.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr.Rudra Deo, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party : Mr.Shailendra Kumar,A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 30-04-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner is languishing in custody since
01.05.2018 in a case for the offence registered under Section
364 of the IPC. Later on, Sections 302, 201 and 120(B)/34 of
the IPC., were also added.

The prosecution story, in brief, is that the brother of
the informant went to Maheshwari Plaza, Rampur Nahar, on
17.04.2018 at 10.30 P.M., but he did not return till 10.00
A.M. on the next day. Thereafter, he tried to search him and
went to Maheshwari Plaza then he got information from the
Guard that his brother Babloo Ram had not come on such date.
During search, he further got information from Krishna Rai that



on 18.04.2018 at 10.00 P.M. a man with Jharu was kidnapped by some unknown persons miscreants were in white car and they assaulted him also and fled away east of Rampur Nahar Road. He further alleged that two days prior to the occurrence, Fenku Ram, Poonam Devi, Sikandar Ram, Kundan Kumar, Raju Dom, had threatened to kill Babloo Ram during quarrel between them and family members of the informant and on this basis, informant raised suspicion against them.

It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has got no criminal antecedent. Charge sheet has been submitted in the present case. There is no allegation of tampering with the witnesses alleged against the petitioner. The petitioner has been made accused in the present case merely on the basis of suspicion. The informant is not an eye witness to the alleged occurrence. Subsequently, confession of the petitioner was recorded before the police. Except for confession of the petitioner, there is no substantive evidence to suggest the implication of the petitioner in the present case.

On behalf of the learned counsel for the State, it has been submitted that the petitioner is named in the F.I.R.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, let the petitioner above named, be released on bail on furnishing



bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned A.C.J.M.- VI, Patna City, Patna, in connection with Sultanganj P.S. Case No. 87 of 2018.

(Sudhir Singh, J)

U.K./-

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

