

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.56479 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-274 Year-2020 Thana- HARSIDHI District- East Champaran

Saddam @ Saddam Hussain Son of Nemaji Mian Resident of Village -
Pakadiya, P.O. and P.s.- Harsidhi, Distt.- East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pravin Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Mohammad Sufyan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

3 28-06-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a

case registered for the offences punishable under Section

302/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The prosecution case as per F.I.R is that the

husband of the daughter of the informant works in

foreign country and his daughter was engaged in money

transaction with some of her co-villagers. It is alleged

that whenever she demanded her money back, the

accused persons put pressure upon her for physical

relationship. It is further alleged that on the date of



occurrence, when he went at the house of her daughter, it was locked and after getting information, he reached near Durga Temple of Harsidhi market where he found her daughter dead. The petitioner is alleged to have seen at the dead body of the daughter of the informant.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that there is no direct evidence of committing murder of the daughter of the deceased against the petitioner. The petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case on mere suspicion.

Learned A.P.P. appearing on behalf of the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submitted that petitioner was seen at the dead body of the victim. There is direct allegation against the petitioner that he took money from the victim and when she demanded her money back, he put pressure upon the victim along with other co-accused to establish physical relationship. There is ample evidence against the petitioner in the case diary.



Considering the circumstantial evidence against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner stands rejected.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

Shageer/-

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

