

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2298 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-203 Year-2021 Thana- TEKARI District- Gaya

1. ISHWAR MANJHI Son of Late Manghu Manjhi Resident of Village and Post- Jalalpur, P.S.- Tikari, District- Gaya.
2. Salit Manjhi @ Salita Manjhi Son of Subedar Manjhi Resident of Village and Post- Jalalpur, P.S.- Tikari, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Mithlesh Kumar Khare

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

2 04-08-2022 Learned counsel for the petitioners is directed to remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within one month.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned APP for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Tekari P.S. Case No. 203 of 2021, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 304 (B), 201, 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The informant Sanju Manjhi made allegation that his son-in-law Lalit Manjhi informed her that the daughter of the informant had sustained injuries after falling from the roof. He rushed to the matrimonial house of his daughter. The inmates of the house were absconding. He came to know from the villagers that they had cremated the dead body stealthily in the midnight at two o'clock. The



informant made allegation that the accused persons named in the FIR including the petitioners, prior to the occurrence were inflicting torture upon the deceased due to non-fulfillment of motorcycle.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that petitioner No. 1 is not the family members of the husband of the deceased rather he is maternal grandfather of the husband of the deceased. He has submitted so far as petitioner No. 2 is concerned he is brother-in-law (*devar*) of the deceased. Both the petitioners have falsely been implicated.

From bare perusal of the impugned order it appears that the witnesses in paragraph No. 7, 9, 10 and 11 have fully supported the prosecution version and the investigation is still going on. At this stage, I do not find it to be a fit case for anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioners within the stipulated time provided in para-1 hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

SONALI/-

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

