

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13707 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-291 Year-2019 Thana- CHHATAPUR District- Supaul

Sanjay Das, Male, aged about 36 years, Son of Heeralal Das, Resident of
Village - Chakla, P.S.- Chhatapur, District- Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kumar Goutam, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Mukesh Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 03-06-2020 Heard Shri Devendra Kumar Sinha, learned Senior
counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State
through the virtual court proceeding.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Chhatapur P.S. Case No. 291 of 2019 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 302, 201, 120B & 34 of the Indian
Penal Code.

The prosecution case is based on the written statement
of one Bindula Devi in which she alleged that her father-in-law
went for the money before one Heera Lal Das on 13.11.2019
and did not return till evening. The informant further alleged
that she went to Raghopur in search of her father-in-law and
returned back to the house of Heera Lal Das when she did not
got any information about her father-in-law. The informant



further alleged that on 20.11.2019, she received information that a dead body was recovered beside the river Gaida at Laxmipur Domrahi.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. There is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner. He further submits that after perusal of the F.I.R. it appears that the informant herself stated that her father-in-law is missing and she further identified a dead body as his father-in-law but there is no confirmative evidence except the statement of the informant with regard to dead body. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that prior to recovery of dead body no information for missing has been lodged by the informant even after the knowledge that her father-in-law was missing from 13.11.2019. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is in jail custody since 26.11.2019.

I have perused the case diary and paragraphs 14, 24, 27, 28, 32, 33 and 34 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the



prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner is hereby rejected in connection with Chhatapur P.S. Case No.291 of 2019. However, the petitioner is directed to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Nasimul/-

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

