

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64189 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-580 Year-2012 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Lakhisarai

=====

Damru Singh @ Punjay Kumar Son of Ram Swaroop Singh Resident of - B
96, Dakshin Puri , Dr. Ambedkar Nagar , Dist- South Delhi , Delhi - 110062
Presently at - Vill- Ghoghi, P.o and p.s-Piri Bazar , Dist- Lakhisarai , Bihar -
811112

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sobha Devi wife of Nageshwar Manjhi Resident of village- Ghoghi Musahri
P.o and p.s-Piri Bazar , Dist- Lakhisarai , Bihar - 811112

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Munish Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Pranav Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 24-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in Complaint Case No.580C of 2012 (Piribazar P. S. Case
No.01 of 2010) registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 302, 201 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has antecedent of one case and the complainant
alleges that her son aged about 03 years was missing since
14.02.2010, on 15.02.2010, the dead body of his son was
recovered from the Well of Gunu Singh. It is next alleged that
Kartik saw the petitioner, Raj Kumar, Jai Ram, Sohan and



Mohan going towards the Well of Gunu Singh at the time of occurrence.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner based on suspicion came to be implicated when Kartik is not an eye witness to the occurrence. It is next submitted that police after threadbare investigation came to a considered conclusion that petitioner is innocent and thus submitted that final form dated 15.02.2012 exonerating the petitioner of the allegation, but then, the informant instituted protest-cum-complaint case no.580C of 2012, in which the learned trial Court took cognizance of the offences under Sections 302 I.P.C. read with other Sections by an order dated 09.04.2015. The learned counsel submits that when one investigating agency after threadbare investigation came to a considered conclusion that petitioner is innocent whether it would be prudent for the Court to send the petitioner to jail based on an order of cognizance which came to be taken based on protest application.

5. Learned A.P.P. vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that from perusal of the order impugned, it would manifest that after cognizance was taken in the case, the petitioner filed ABP No.77 of 2012, which came to



be disposed of by an order dated 18.05.2015, but then, it appears that the petitioner did not move before this Court seeking anticipatory bail nor moved before the learned trial Court seeking regular bail rather was evading the law. It is submitted that 10 years after rejection of the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner, the petitioner once again moved before the learned Additional Sessions Judge-Vth, Lakhisarai seeking anticipatory bail which came to be rejected on 01.08.2025. It is submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

