

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.29621 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -30 Year- 2016 Thana -SIDHWALIA District- GOPALGANJ

Manju Devi @ Manju Kuwar Wife of Late Chhotelal Prasad resident of
village - Bazar Khajuriya, Police Station Sidhwalia, District - Gopalganj

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Lokesh Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mritunjay Kumar Nirala, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR
JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 27-09-2016 Heard both sides.

The petitioner apprehends her arrest in Sidhwalia P.S.
Case No. 30/2016, registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 304B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The informant alleged that his daughter was married
with Dipak Kumar in the month of April, 2014. Dipak Kumar
went to foreign country to earn his livelihood. Mother-in-law and
other in-laws of the deceased were subjecting her to physical and
mental torture due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry. On
14.04.2016 the informant got information that at the instance of
Dipak Kumar Manju Devi the petitioner and her sons burnt his
daughter to death.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner

is the mother-in-law of the deceased. There is no evidence to show that the petitioner burnt her daughter-in-law to death. The witnesses also stated that while the deceased was cooking food she got accidental fire and died. Petitioner and others made all efforts to save the life of the deceased, but while she was being taken to Gorakhpur hospital she succumbed to her burn injuries.

On the other hand learned counsel for the informant as well as learned A.P.P. opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

It appears that the petitioner is mother-in-law of the deceased. The deceased died due to severe burn injuries. The husband of the deceased had gone to foreign country to earn his livelihood and the deceased was living with the petitioner.

Considering the facts aforesaid and the fact that the petitioner was torturing the deceased due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above-named on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J.)

Vinita/-

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