

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.5164 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-266 Year-2023 Thana- ADAPUR District- East Champaran

Ramesh Kumar Sinha @ Ramesh Singh S/O Late Satya Narayan Singh R/O
Murtiya, P.S.- Adapur, District- East Champaran.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sunita Devi W/O Bachha Paswan R/O- Shyanpur, P.S.- Adapur, District-
East Champaran

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Ms. Alka Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Ms. Usha Kumari 1, Spl. P.P. Ms. Shiwani Kumari, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 15-07-2024 Heard the parties.

2. This appeal has been filed by the appellant against the order dated 16.10.2023 passed by learned Special Judge, SC/ST Act, East Champaran, Motihari whereby the prayer for bail of the appellant in connection with Adapur P.S. Case no. 266 of 2023 under Sections 341, 302, 120B, 504, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, Section 27 of the Arms Act and Sections 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act was rejected.

3. The prosecution story, in brief, is that when the informant along with her son and husband was at the place of occurrence, three bike-borne persons came there and shot her husband due to which he died on spot. It is further alleged that the appellant along with others used to threaten and abuse the deceased with respect to land dispute.



4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that appellant has been falsely implicated in this case due to political rivalry. He has not taken the caste name of the informant in public view. No offence is made out under the provisions of the SC/ST Act against him. The name of the appellant has come during the course of investigation. There is no specific overt act of commission of murder against the appellant.

5. Learned counsels for the State as well as for the Respondent No. 2 vehemently opposed the prayer for bail by contending that there is specific allegation against the appellant for committing murder of the husband of the informant. It is further contended that the appellant has got 12 criminal antecedents, out of which, some are of similar nature. Hence, appellant does not deserve to be enlarged on bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances as well as long criminal history of the appellant, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the appellant. His prayer for bail is, accordingly, rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

utkarsh/-

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

