

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.47692 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -17 Year- 2016 Thana -SISWAN District- SIWAN

=====

DHRUP SINGH @ DHRUW SINGH @ Dhruw Singh son of Late Indrasan
Singh respondent of village Dera Rai Ke Bangra, P.S. M.H.Nagar, Siwan
..... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

..... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kundan Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Nirmal Kumar Sinha

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

2 09-11-2016 Heard the counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Nirmal
Kumar Sinha, learned APP for the State.

The petitioner being the father-in-law of the deceased is
facing prosecution under sections 304-B and 201/34 IPC vide
Siswan (M .H. Nagar) P.S. Case No. 17 of 2016.

The father of the victim lodged the case that the
deceased was married to the son of the petitioner only six years
ago whereafter she was subjected to torture on account of non-
fulfilment of demand of dowry which was narrated to him by the
deceased herself. On the date of occurrence, it was informed that
she was precariously ill. He went to the hospital where her
daughter was being treated. Her body had turned pale. She was
referred to the PMCH and on way to the hospital she died
whereafter the accused persons disposed of her deadbody.

The contention of the petitioner is that the victim was afforded treatment. It is the prime responsibility of the husband and not the father-in-law. The informant was present at the hospital but after few days lodged the case. It is further stated that the petitioner is in custody since 01.08.2016.

Learned APP opposed the prayer and submitted that within 07 years of marriage the victim was done to death at her *Sasural* in the suspicious circumstances. The presumption of law is against the petitioner. In course of investigation, the witnesses have supported the case as it would appear from the impugned order.

Considering the allegation and other materials reflected from the records, I am not persuaded to extend the petitioner the privilege of bail. The prayer is rejected.

If the trial does not record adequate progress within 11 months of the receipt/production of a copy of this order, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the court below itself.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

HR/-

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