

of dated 13.10.2023. He further points out that there are no injuries found on the body of the deceased. It is submitted that considering the allegations against the applicant, he alleged to have used steel rod.

4. He, therefore, submits that the applicant may be released on bail as his further custody is not required in view of the fact that the charge-sheet has been filed.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP strongly opposed the application, on the ground that there is prima facie evidence available against the applicant to show his complicity in the alleged offence.

6. After going through the charge-sheet and the relevant material collected by the IO during the investigation, it is evident that the deceased was brutally murdered. There were 36 injuries found on the body of the deceased. Though in the FIR the applicant was not named, but in the supplementary statement recorded on next day a specific role was attributed to the applicant and furthermore, two eyewitness have also named the applicant in their statements. There are allegations of conspiracy and unlawful assembly with common intention.

7. In the circumstances, though no weapon was recovered from the applicant, considering the fact that there is sufficient evidence to prima facie show that the applicant was present on the spot, I am of the opinion that this is not a fit case for grant of bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

(ANIL S. KILOR, J)