

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28028 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1279 Year-2024 Thana- NAWADA District- Nawada

Manju Manjhi @ Manju Manhi S/O Rupan Manjhi Resident Of Village-
Shobhia, Ps- Nagar, Dist.- Nawada

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vibhuti Ranjan Sonvadra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Lakshmi Kant Sharma, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

3 05-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Nawada P.S. Case No. 1279 of 2024 instituted for the offence
under Sections 103(1) & 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,
2023.

3. As per prosecution case, it is alleged that petitioner
along with co-accused killed informant's son.

4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner
that the petitioner is in custody since 30-10-2024. Petitioner
bears two criminal antecedents, as per disclosure made in
paragraph No. 3 of the bail application.

5. It has been further submitted by the petitioner's



counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Petitioner is not named in the FIR. Name of the petitioner has transpired on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused, namely, Bichchi Devi, and the same has no evidentiary value in the eye of law. Investigation reveals that Bichchi Devi was in a love affair with the deceased and, upon refusal of marriage, conspired with Karu Chaudhary to kill him. The motive behind the murder was personal resentment and loss of benefit after the deceased's marriage was fixed with another girl. There is no independent material or evidence on record against the petitioner.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. It is contended that co-accused, Bichchi Devi, in her confessional statement has confessed her guilt and has very specifically stated that petitioner was holding the legs of the deceased during commission of the offence. As per postmortem, cause of death is asphyxia due to suffocation. It is fervently submitted that the complicity of the petitioner cannot be ruled out as he was present during the commission of offence.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, there being enough material against the petitioner to



establish his complicity in the occurrence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer for grant of bail is hereby *rejected*.

8. The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as expeditiously as possible without any undue delay and unnecessary adjournments

9. However, petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail, if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from today.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

