

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36749 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-14 Year-2022 Thana- MAHILA P.S BAGHA District- West
Champaran

=====

Pappu Rao @ Pappu Singh Son Of Ram Suchit Rao Resident Of Village-
Sirisiya, Police Station- Bhairganj, District- West Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Vijay Kr Singh No. 1
	:	Mr.Yogesh Chandra Verma, Sr. Adv
For the Informant/s	:	Mrs.Pruna Anand
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Chandra Sen Prasad Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

3 01-02-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State.

The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with
Bagaha Mahila P.S. Case No. 14 of 2022 instituted for the
offence under Sections 341, 323, 354, 376, 302, 201, 120(B),
504, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Prosecution case relates to commission of rape upon
the informant by the petitioner on pretext of solemnization of
marriage and thereafter committed murder of the victim.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and committed no offence. He has
falsely been implicated in this present case. According to



prosecution version, victim was in relationship for last six months with the petitioner but earlier she never made complaint with respect of commission of rape. It is further submitted that there is no direct evidence which may prove any complicity of the petitioner. The petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 20.2.2022.

Learned APP appearing for the state and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer of regular bail and submitted that the FIR may be treated as dying declaration. The written application of the informant shows that the direct allegation against the petitioner is of commission of rape upon the victim on pretext of solemnization of marriage thereafter he murdered the victim with cooperation of other co-accused persons. At the instance of this petitioner, dead body of the victim was recovered and this fact is admissible in the eye of law. It is further submitted that the prosecution witnesses have also supported the prosecution version.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of allegation, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and, as such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.



The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and
conclude the same as soon as possible.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

amandeep/-

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

