

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59567 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-10 Year-2021 Thana- PIPRA District- Patna

Rinku Yadav S/O Ramkripal Yadav R/O Village-Sheikhpura, P.S-Pipra,
District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.D.K. Sinha, Sr. Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr.Sanjay Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Amit Kumar Rakesh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 11-04-2022 Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner,

learned counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the

State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Pipra P.S.

Case No. 10 of 2021 registered for the offences punishable

under Sections 323, 302, 504 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that

the petitioner is in custody since 25.01.2021, charge-sheet has

been submitted in the case and has antecedent of one case.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that

the informant alleges that she suspects that her son was killed by

the petitioner and Pintu in connivance with her daughter-in-law

as the deceased had sold some land and the petitioner and Pintu



used to visit the house of the deceased regularly.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and from bare perusal of the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. it would manifest that the informant who is mother of the deceased has alleged that in the night she heard his son and his wife quarreling and also heard some unusual sound and in the morning when she opened the door, she saw her son dead and his wife weeping. Learned counsel thus submits that as per the allegation as alleged by the informant in the F.I.R., the prime suspect of the occurrence is the wife of the deceased, no doubt the informant had alleged that this petitioner also visited the house of her son regularly but has not even remotely whispered that they were also present when she had heard the deceased and his wife quarreling.

Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant vehemently oppose the prayer for bail of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the informant submits that during the course of investigation it has come that wife of the deceased was having illicit relation with this petitioner, further she was also aggrieved by the fact that the deceased had sold a land to someone else and not to this petitioner on which there



was a quarrel between the two, two days prior to the occurrence. Learned counsel for the informant further submits that the wife of the deceased in her confessional statement has given a very vivid description of the occurrence that how on account of her relationship, the petitioner, Rinku came in her house in the night at 10 pm and thereafter when her husband woke up how they killed him in connivance with her. Learned counsel for the informant further submits that as submitted by the learned senior counsel for the petitioner that it was the wife who might have killed the deceased also does not gets corroborated from the fact that a women alone cannot kill a man.

Learned A.P.P. for the State submits that prayer for bail of the co-accused Sangita Devi has been rejected vide order dated 11.04.2022 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 62279 of 2021.

Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the informant and the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court for the present is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. His prayer for bail is thus rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishi/-

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

