

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38770 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-275 Year-2021 Thana- SONO District- Jamui

=====

Pramod Yadav son of Vinod Kumar Yadav @ Binod yadav Resident of
Village - Bhithra, P.s.- Sono, District - Jamui.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mukul Jee, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Tarun Prasad Mandal, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN

ORAL ORDER

3 23-11-2022 Let the defect(s), if any, be removed within two weeks
from today.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Sono P.S. Case No. 275 of 2021 lodged under Sections 302,
120B/34 of the I.P.C.

As per the prosecution case, On 07.10.2021 at about
12 noon, the petitioner along with 2 other accused persons
visited to the house of the petitioner and accompanied with the
informant's son and told his son to accompany with them
because they have some work in the market of which the son of
informant went with them but when he did not return till late
evening, the informant started searching but no trace was found.

In course of the search, he received information that a dead body is lying at a nearby place. When informant reached there, he has found a dead body of his son and sleeper of Promod Yadav (Petitioner) and Gamchha of Rajesh Yadav was found near dead body of his son.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He submits that petitioner is in custody since 04.03.2022. There is one case pending against him in which he is on bail. Charge sheet has already been filed in this case.

Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that petitioner's sleeper was found near the dead body. There is specific allegation by the informant that the petitioner along with 2 named other accused persons told his son to accompany with them and went outside and thereafter his dead body was recovered. Learned counsel for the State also submits that his criminal antecedent is of Section 302 of I.P.C. Upon specific query whether charge has been framed in this case or not, counsel submits that charge has not been framed.

In the present facts and circumstances of this case and the submissions made above, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the bail application of the petitioner is

hereby rejected but liberty is hereby granted to the petitioner
that he may renew his prayer for bail 6 months after framing of
charge.

With this observation, the bail application stands
rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

prakashmani/-

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