

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23221 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-532 Year-2020 Thana- BIDUPUR District- Vaishali

1. MANJU DEVI WIFE OF SAGAR MAHTO @ RAM SAGAR MAHTO RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- RAGHOPUR, CHATURANG, PANCHAYAT-AMOR, WARD NO. 5, P.S.- BIDUPUR, DISTRICT- VAISHALI
2. SAGAR MAHTO @ RAM SAGAR MAHTO SON OF LATE SHIKHDEO MAHTO RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- RAGHOPUR, CHATURANG, PANCHAYAT-AMOR, WARD NO. 5, P.S.- BIDUPUR, DISTRICT- VAISHALI
3. PINTU MAHTO @ PINTU KUMAR SON OF SAGAR MAHTO @ RAM SAGAR MAHTO RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- RAGHOPUR, CHATURANG, PANCHAYAT-AMOR, WARD NO. 5, P.S.- BIDUPUR, DISTRICT- VAISHALI
4. RADHA MAHTO @ RADHE SHYAM MAHTO SON OF SAGAR MAHTO @ RAM SAGAR MAHTO RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- RAGHOPUR, CHATURANG, PANCHAYAT-AMOR, WARD NO. 5, P.S.- BIDUPUR, DISTRICT- VAISHALI
5. ANITA DEVI WIFE OF RADHA MAHTO @ RADHE SHYAM MAHTO RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- RAGHOPUR, CHATURANG, PANCHAYAT-AMOR, WARD NO. 5, P.S.- BIDUPUR, DISTRICT- VAISHALI
6. ANCHAL DEVI WIFE OF PINTU MAHTO @ PINTU KUMAR RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- RAGHOPUR, CHATURANG, PANCHAYAT-AMOR, WARD NO. 5, P.S.- BIDUPUR, DISTRICT- VAISHALI

... .. Petitioners

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shyameshwar Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Damodar Prasad Tiwary, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

4 21-03-2022 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



Bidupur P.S. Case No. 532 of 2020, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

As per allegation, petitioner No. 1 Manju Devi and the deceased Shakal Rai were jointly conducting the sale purchase of cattle. Manju Devi had taken Rs. 3,00,000/- on credit from the deceased.

As per allegation, on 04.12.2020, Manju Devi (petitioner No. 1) came to the house of the deceased and asked him to come to her house and receive the money. Shakal Rai did not return to his home, during search the informant came to know on the next day that the dead body of Shakal Rai is hanging on a Mango tree. When the informant went there she saw the dead body of his father was hanging with the Mango tree.

It has been alleged that the accused persons including the petitioners had strangled the deceased to death and hanged the dead body of the deceased to the tree.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioner No. 1 had never received any money from the deceased on credit. He has further submitted that the entire allegation is false.

There is specific allegation in the FIR itself that the petitioner No. 1 has called the deceased from his house by assuring him to provide Rs. 3,00,000/- which she had taken by the deceased. The deceased followed the petitioner No. 1 and later on his dead body was found. The name of the other petitioners have also been figured in the FIR itself. Investigation is still going on. As such, it is not a fit



case for anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, it is rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the pe-
titioners 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	
---	--	---	--

