

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.65649 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-47 Year-2022 Thana- NTPC District- Patna

=====

LALENDER KUMAR @ LALINDER PASWAN @ MEKU Son of Munna  
Paswan Resident of Village- Dariyapur, P.S.- NTPC, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vinay Ranjan

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Pushpa Sinha.1

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR  
PANDEY**

**ORAL ORDER**

6      13-04-2023                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as  
learned APP for the State and the learned counsel for the informant.

In this case, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in connection with NTPC P.S. Case No. 47 of 2022, initially registered for the offences punishable under Sections 363 and 365 of the IPC. Later on, vide order dated 20.06.2022, Section 302, 201/34 of the IPC has been added.

The son of the informant, aged about 15 years went to participate in a marriage party. At the time of *Jaimala* ceremony, he became traceless. Later on, his dead body was found from a well. The informant expressed his firm belief that the petitioner and other accused persons named in the FIR have indulged in the occurrence.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The son of the informant was a participant in the marriage ceremony of daughter of the petitioner. There was no previous enmity between the petitioner and the deceased. He has submitted further that there is no eye witness of the occurrence and the present case is based on



circumstantial evidence.

On the other hand, the learned counsel for the informant as well as the learned APP have submitted that it has been detected during course of investigation that at the occasion of *Tilak* ceremony, the petitioner and his family members prohibited the deceased not to participate in *Baraat* party. Despite this fact, he participated, which was not acceptable to the petitioner and his family members and it was the reason that they killed the deceased and threw his dead in well. He has also submitted that in paragraph nos. 24 and 25 of the case diary, the witnesses have stated that prior to the occurrence, some altercation and scuffle had taken place between the petitioner with his family members and the deceased and thereafter, his dead body was found in a well.

In my view, the petitioner does not deserve the privileges of bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

**(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)**

Kundan/Nirmal

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

