

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31424 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-444 Year-2020 Thana- DANAPUR District- Patna

MANOJ KUMAR Son of Atma Prasad At Present Resident of Shahgang,  
P.S.- Koch, District - Gaya At Present Resident of Nasriganj, North Gali of  
Prem Vatika, P.S.- Danapur, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, Sr. Advocate  
Ms. Priyanka Singh, Advocate  
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Renu Kumari, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      10-05-2023                      Heard learned Senior counsel for the petitioner and  
learned A.P.P. for the State.

The bail application of the petitioner in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code was rejected *vide* order dated 29.03.2022 in Cr. Misc. No. 63647 of 2021.

Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 14.08.2020.

On query of the Court whether charges have been framed against the petitioner or not to which the learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submitted that charges have not been framed.

The Court, in the nature of allegations as alleged in



the FIR and the reasons recorded in the order dated 29.03.2022 in Cr. Misc. No. 63647 of 2021, is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

At this stage, the learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the informant is not an eye-witness to the occurrence and the entire allegation hinges around suspicion as the mobile of the deceased was found in possession of the petitioner, it is also submitted that at times it happens that unintentionally people buy mobile phones without appreciating its consequences. It is further submitted that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent.

This also does not persuade the Court to release the petitioner on bail.

The prayer for bail of the petitioner is thus rejected.

However, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

Rishi-II

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

