

Kanhaiya Jee Choudhary
Principal Sessions Judge, Purnea.
BP No.203 of 2026/CIS No.203 of 2026
(arising out of Baisi P.S. Case No.30 of 2026)
Aadesh Sharma Versus State
Date of Order : 19.3.2026

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, PURNEA

B.P. No.203 of 2026/CIS No.203 of 2026

Aadesh Sharma, aged about 45 years S/o Jangli Sharma, R/o village Chariya
Colony, P.S. Baisi, District Purnea. .. Petitioner.

Versus

State of Bihar

.. Opp.Party.

Date of order or proceeding	Order with signature of the court	Office action taken with date
19.3.2026	Bail Petition filed on behalf of the petitioner, namely, Aadesh Sharma, who is in judicial custody 21.1.2026 in connection with Baisi P.S. Case No.30 of 2026 registered for the offence under sections 103(1) and 3(5) of the BNS is put-up for hearing. 2. Heard Sri Neyaz Ahmad, learned counsel for petitioner and Sri U.K.Keshari, the learned P.P. appearing for the State. 3. As per written report of the Informant, the prosecution case, in brief, is that daughter of the Informant, namely, Parwati Devi was married with petitioner Aadesh Sharma 20 years ago. During wed lock, she was blessed two children. It is further stated that an illicit relation is going on of the petitioner with Co-accused Minati Devi. On 19.1.2026 at about 9 P.M., daughter of the Informant (deceased) informed the Informant on mobile that when protested the illicit relation of her husband (petitioner) with co-accused Minati Devi then her husband abused and assaulted her and this is her last call. On 20.1.2026 at about 7 A.M., Informant received information that dead body of his daughter Parwati Devi is laying by the side of Sathara Kabristan hanging with tree. It is further alleged that this petitioner being husband of the deceased and co-accused Minati Devi in furtherance of their common intention of both committed murder of his daughter. 4. The learned counsel of the petitioner has submitted that	

Contd. 19.3.2026	petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case with a view to extort money and the entire allegation levelled against the petitioner are false and concocted. He also submitted that deceased committed suicide. If the petitioner killed her then why he was near the plum tree and took out the body from the tree. During 20 years of wed lock of the petitioner with the deceased, there is no complained against the petitioner. There is no eye witness of the occurrence. No incriminating article has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. He also submitted that from perusal of the anti-mortem report, it transpires that no any injury was found over the body of the deceased. Petitioner is a man of clean antecedent and he is in judicial custody since 21.1.2026. So, prayed for bail. 5. On the other hand, the learned P.P. has opposed the prayer of bail and submitted that petitioner is husband of the deceased and he is more responsible for the alleged occurrence and investigation of the case is still pending. So, petitioner doesnot deserve the benefit of bail. 6. I have heard the rival submissions of both the parties and perused the case record, case diary. From perusal of the same, it is case of murder of daughter of the Informant Parwati Devi and this petitioner is named in the FIR being husband of the deceased with allegation that this petitioner and co-accused Minati Devi being lover of this petitioner in furtherance of their common intention committed murder of the deceased as deceased being wife of the petitioner protested the illicit relation of her husband (petitioner) with co-accused Minati Devi. From perusal of the Post mortem report of the deceased, it appears that doctor has opined the cause of death of the deceased is Asphyxia and Venous congestion caused due to strangulation by ligature and the hanging of body is opined	
---------------------	--	--

Contd. 19.3.2026	as Post mortem hanging. It means death of deceased is unnatural and after death the body was hanged to show case of suicide but doctor opinion the hanging was Post mortem. Though, there is no eye witness of the occurrence but from perusal of the written report of the Informant and materials available on record and case diary, petitioner has motive behind the alleged occurrence as deceased protested the illicit relation of this petitioner with co-accused and petitioner being the husband of the deceased is more responsible for the alleged occurrence. Investigation of the case is still pending. 7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, manner of allegation against this petitioner being husband of the deceased is heinous in nature and this petitioner being husband of the deceased is more responsible for the alleged occurrence and investigation of the case is still pending, so, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Hence, prayer of bail of the petitioner,namely, Aadesh Sharma is,hereby, rejected. (Dictated) Sd/- Principal Sessions Judge,Purnea. <table><tr><td>Date of Order</td><td>19.3.2026</td></tr><tr><td>Date of Reserving Judgment/ order</td><td>19.03.2026</td></tr><tr><td>Uploading Date</td><td>25.3.2026</td></tr><tr><td>Uploaded by</td><td>Kumar Sanjay,Steno</td></tr></table>	Date of Order	19.3.2026	Date of Reserving Judgment/ order	19.03.2026	Uploading Date	25.3.2026	Uploaded by	Kumar Sanjay,Steno
Date of Order	19.3.2026								
Date of Reserving Judgment/ order	19.03.2026								
Uploading Date	25.3.2026								
Uploaded by	Kumar Sanjay,Steno								