

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23916 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-327 Year-2023 Thana- PALASI District- Araria

=====

Pramod Mandal @ Pramod Kumar Mandal Son of Late Ravi Lal Mandal @
Sugan Lal Mandal Resident of Village- Chouri, Ward No.-04, P.S.- Palasi,
Dist.- Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mrigendra Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Vinod Shanker Modi, APP

Mr. Gopal Kumar Jha, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 21-09-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP

for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 302, 201 and 34 of the IPC in connection with Palasi
P.S. Case No.327 of 2023.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is brother-in-law
of the deceased and the informant alleges that his daughter was
married to Prem (brother of the petitioner) and out of the
wedlock two children were born, further his daughter informed
that petitioner in absence of her husband acts inappropriately
and on objection threatens of dire consequences, it is further



alleged that his son-in-law works outside the State and in his absence his daughter was found murdered with throat slit and her body was lying in a maize field thus based on suspicion alleges that petitioner killed her.

4. The learned counsel submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is also submitted that informant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence, rather the entire allegation hinges around suspicion.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that what is not disputed rather stands admitted is that the daughter of the informant was killed and her body was found lying in a maize field with throat slit, it is also submitted that based on suspicion the petitioner was arrested and he confessed his crime before the police and based on his confession he came to be implicated, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that confession before the police has no evidentiary value. It is also submitted that the deceased was found murdered with throat slit, but then the weapon of crime was not recovered, which amply demonstrates that apart from confession there is nothing which could connect the petitioner with the offence.

6. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the



informant at this stage submits that charges have been framed. Since charges have been framed as such, the Court for the present is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

7. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after the informant deposes in the trial. It is also made clear that if the informant does not depose in the trial within a period of six months from today, in that event also, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Prakash Narayan

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

