

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.54940 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-55 Year-2008 Thana- RAIL District- Lakhisarai

1. Praveen Singh @ Pravin Singh Son of Ramanugrah Singh Resident of Vill- Babhangawan, P.S.- Lakhisarai (Amahra), District- Begusarai.
2. Naveen Singh @ Navin Singh Son of Ramanugrah Singh Resident of Vill- Babhangawan, P.S.- Lakhisarai (Amahra), District- Begusarai.
3. Vibhishan Singh Son of Raj Kishore Singh Resident of Vill- Babhangawan, P.S.- Lakhisarai (Amahra), District- Begusarai.
4. Pappu Singh @ Kamal Nayan Singh Son of Ramanand Singh Resident of Vill- Babhangawan, P.S.- Lakhisarai (Amahra), District- Begusarai.
5. Vinod Singh @ Binod Singh Son of Rajendra Singh Resident of Vill- Babhangawan, P.S.- Lakhisarai (Amahra), District- Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mukesh Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Ram Sevak Choudhary, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 23-10-2024 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioners are in judicial custody in connection with Lakhisarai Rail Kiul P.S. Case No. 55 of 2008 for the offence under Section 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code lodged on 17.10.2008 by the informant, Prem Lata Devi.

3. The prosecution story is of the year 2008 in which the petitioners were named accused. As per the prosecution story, the informant, the widow alleged that she reached Mankatha Station along with her husband, brother-in-law and mother-in-law. When these accused persons came, abused and



later resorted to firing which resulted into the death of her husband. The motive has been assigned to be previous dispute relating to killing of the cousin brother in the year 2005. Accordingly, the F.I.R.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that earlier charge sheet was not submitted against them and as such, they delayed coming to the Court.

5. Learned APP on the other hand has pointed out that the cognizance in the matter was taken against these petitioners on 15.03.2010 and only after the process under section 82 and 83 of the Cr.P.C. was issued that they chose to surrender.

6. Though learned counsel for the petitioner tried to take this Court to the fact that one of the accused faced the trial and has been acquitted, considering the allegation that has come, coupled with the fact that for sixteen years they evaded arrest despite being named in the F.I.R. when cognizance was taken in the year 2010, it would be appropriate that they too face trial.

7. Accordingly, the bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

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

