

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.75019 of 2018**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-138 Year-2017 Thana- PATNA RAIL P.S. District- Patna

Ravi Shankar Kumar Akela Son of Kameshwar Prasad, Resident of Village-  
Karpi, P.S.- Mahakar, District- Gaya, Present address- New Yarpur, Rajkamal  
Niwas, South of Poddar Bhawan, P.S.- Gardanibagh, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jagjit Roshan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sri Shailendra Kumar Singh

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRIYA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

5      22-02-2019                      Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the  
learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in S. Tr. No. 30/2018,  
arising out of Patna Rail P.S. Case No. 138/2017, instituted for  
offences under Section(s) 363 and 365 of the Indian Penal Code.  
Later on Sections 302, 201, 120(B), 376, 406, 420, 467, 468 and  
471 of the Indian Penal Code were also added.

The written report has been filed by the father of  
victim (since deceased) alleging therein that his younger  
daughter Manorama Kumari had got reservation on 10.03.2017  
from Patna Junction to Dhanbad in Ganga Damodar Express.  
Daughter of informant reached station to board Ganga Damodar  
Express but she neither reached Dhanbad nor reached to her



house. Informant informed the police that his daughter is traceless from Patna Junction since 10.03.2017. He also mentioned in the written report that his daughter was having mobile phone bearing no. 9199593947, which was found switched off. Thereafter informant and other family members made search but they could not get any trace.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that one dead body was found on the track near 4 PG Gate Man UP Home for which U.D. Case No. 20 of 2017 was registered on 11.03.2017 at Patna G.R.P. Post-mortem was done on 15.03.2017. Sister of deceased identified the dead body found in U.D. Case No. 20/2017. She also filed application dated 14.04.2017 stating therein that deceased was in touch with petitioner regarding her job in Welfare Department as promised by the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that mere suspicion has been raised against this petitioner. Police has recorded the confessional statement of this petitioner under coercion after the arrest.

Learned counsel for the State after looking into case diary has submitted that during investigation police on the basis of C.D.R. found that the victim (since deceased) had talked to



this petitioner on his mobile phone several times. It has also come during investigation that this petitioner had assured her job in Welfare Department, Patna. She often used to come to meet him. On the date of occurrence she had also come to meet this petitioner in Patna.

Learned counsel for the State has further stated that informant is father of victim. Mother and sister of the victim has stated in detail that this petitioner used to talk to the victim on telephone and he had promised to get her job in Welfare Department. Victim had also given money to him after selling the land belonging to her mother. Police has arrested this petitioner on the basis of C.D.R. as well as statement of the mother and sister of victim. He has further submitted that petitioner has stated in detail in his confessional statement about the manner in which he had pushed the victim on railway track on the date of occurrence and fled away. Thereafter U.D. Case has been filed after recovery of dead body. Confessional statement of petitioner has been recorded in detail in para 151 of case diary. Police recovered different articles belonging to the victim (since deceased) from possession of the petitioner. It has also come during investigation that this petitioner had got L.I.C. in the name of victim making himself nominee with plan to



claim the insured amount after committing her murder. The police has mentioned in detail about criminal antecedent of the petitioner in para 270 of case diary which shows that he is accused in several other cases of serious nature. The police after investigation found the case true against the petitioner and submitted charge-sheet against him.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, prayer of the petitioner for grant of bail is rejected.

**(Sanjay Priya, J)**

rakhi/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

