

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86974 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-57 Year-2024 Thana- KARPURIGRAM District- Samastipur

1. Manoj Ram Son of Madan Ram Resident of Village - Ram Kishnpur Ganj,
P.S. - Karpurigram, District - Samastipur
2. Sunita Devi Wife of Madan Ram Resident of Village - Ram Kishnpur Ganj,
P.S. - Karpurigram, District - Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nachiketa Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Gulnar Begum, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 19-04-2025 Heard Mr. Nachiketa Jha, learned counsel for the

petitioners and learned learned Additional Public Prosecutor for

the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in
connection with Karpoorigram P.S. Case No. 57 of 2024, F.I.R.
dated 21.05.2024 for the offences punishable under Sections
302 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. According to prosecution case, the informant
solemnized her daughter's marriage with the petitioner in the
year 2013 and out of the wedlock two son was born, namely,
Aditya Kumar aged about 8 years and Piyush Kumar aged about
5 years respectively. Due to some family feud, the petitioner



assaulted the daughter of the informant and on 11.05.2024 some dispute arose between the both and all the family members including the petitioners assaulted the daughter of the informant and killed her by hanging her.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner have clean antecedent and they have falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. is false and fabricated and the petitioners have not committed any offences as alleged in the F.I.R. He further submits that date of occurrence as alleged in the F.I.R. is 17.05.2024 but the present F.I.R. was instituted on 21.05.2024 i.e. after delay of 4 days without giving any explanation of the said delay. It appears from the F.I.R. itself that informant is not eye witness of the alleged occurrence and the son of the petitioner no. 1, namely, Aditya Kumar categorically stated that the deceased had committed suicide herself and apart from that he also stated that after some days of the treatment his mother had died.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor on the basis of material available on record and case diary has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners and submits that from the perusal of the postmortem report it is



evident that the postmortem of the dead body was done on 17.05.2024 itself (date of occurrence) which falsify the statement of the Aditya Kumar. It also appears from the postmortem report that the number of external and internal injuries have been found on the body of the deceased.

6. Considering the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R and the material available on record, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in connection with Karpoorigram P.S. Case No. 57 of 2024 pending in the court of Judicial Magistrate-I, Samastipur.

7. Prayer is refused.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J.)

Jyoti Kumari/-

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

