

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18300 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-270 Year-2023 Thana- LAKHNAUR District- Madhubani

Sanjeev Thakur @ Kanhaiya Thakur @ Pankaj Kumar Thakur S/o
Chaturanand Thakur R/o Village- Jagdar Baluatol, PS- Lakhnaur, Distt.-
Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Murari Narain Chaudhary, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Choubey Jawahar, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

4 24-06-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.
Choubey Jawahar, learned APP for the State. Perused the case
diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Lakhnaur P.S. Case No. 270 of 2023 (G.R. No. 2197 of 2023)
instituted for the offences under Sections 302/34 of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, the accusation against the
petitioner and his mother is of brutally assaulting the
Informant's daughter due to which she succumbed to her
injuries.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged
against him and has falsely been implicated in the present case



due to ulterior motive. The petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. The petitioner is the husband of the deceased. He further submits that as a matter of fact, no such occurrence as alleged in the F.I.R. has taken place rather the deceased has died her natural death due to some illness. He further submits that the deceased used to live at her maternal home for last few days and, as soon as know about her condition, he rushed there and admitted at R.P.S. Hospital, Pandual but, she could not survive and died. From the postmortem report, it appears that no injury, either external or internal, was found over her body. In course of investigation, not a single independent witness has come forward to support the case of the prosecution. Charge-sheet has been submitted only against the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no direct or specific allegation of any overt act against the petitioner rather the same is general and omnibus in nature. The petitioner has one criminal antecedent and is languishing in judicial custody since 02.08.2024 without any rhymes or reason.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, stating that the offence alleged against the petitioner is serious



in nature. He further submits that the postmortem report supports the prosecution case. The Investigating Officer, after completion of investigation, has found the case true and has submitted charge-sheet against the petitioner. The petitioner is named in the F.I.R. and, hence, he does not deserve bail.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature and gravity of the offence as alleged against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner, above named, is rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously. If the trial is not concluded within the aforesaid period of six months from today, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail before the court below which will be decided on its merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

