

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.36076 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -92 Year- 2014 Thana -SAHAR District- BHOJPUR

=====

1. Dhirendra Singh Son of Chitnandan Singh Resident of village - Nonaur,
P.S. Sahar, District - Bhojpur at Ara (Bihar)

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Kanhaiya Kishore (App)

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN
SHARMA**
ORAL ORDER

3 24-11-2015 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sahar
P.S.Case No. 92 of 2014 for the offences punishable under
Sections 304(B), 201 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, pending in
the Court of learned C.J.M., Bhojpur at Ara.

Guriya Devi, the daughter of the informant, was married
with the petitioner on 18.04.2012 and due to non fulfilment of
demand of cash of Rs. 90,000/- for motorcycle she was tortured
and ultimately she was killed and made the dead body traceless.

Submission is of false implication and that the wife
of the petitioner had died due to diarrhea. She was treated by Dr.
Umesh Singh but she was not saved. During supervision, the

Dy.S.P. and S.P. have found that the family members of the informant were present in the cremation and the petitioner is suffering in custody since 10.11.2014 having no criminal antecedent and there is no chance of tampering with the prosecution evidence.

Learned A.P.P. opposes the prayer of bail and submits that Dr. Umesh Singh has not supported the version of the defence that he treated the wife of the petitioner vide para 30 of the case diary and further no one has come to support that the wife of the petitioner has died due to diarrhea rather the witnesses have supported the prosecution version.

In the facts and circumstances, as stated above, considering the allegation attributed against the petitioner serious in nature, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and accordingly his prayer for bail stands rejected.

However, the trial court is directed to conclude the trial as early as possible preferably within a period of six months taking the same on priority basis and if the trial is not concluded, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

singh/-

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

