

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.18064 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -167 Year- 2015 Thana -SONO District- JAMUI

=====

1. Mithilesh Thakur son of Raju Thakur, resident of Village- Dahiyari, P.S.-
Sono, Dist- Jamui..... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prabhat Ranjan Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Suresh Pd.Singh(App)

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

4 27-06-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel representing the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sono P.S.
Case No. 167 of 2015 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 304B, 201 of the Indian Penal Code.

Kajal Kumari, the daughter of the informant, was married
to the petitioner in the year 2014 and allegedly, the petitioner used
to demand motorcycle and due to non-fulfillment he used to
torture and assault his wife and that information was given by
Kajal Kumari to her father and ultimately she was killed and her
dead body was thrown in a well near the village.

Submission is of false implication and that the petitioner
never demanded anything, there was cordial relation between the
petitioner and his wife, chargesheet has already been submitted

and there is no chance of tampering with the prosecution evidence, the petitioner is suffering in custody since 19.10.2015 and as such the petitioner deserves sympathetic consideration to which the learned APP opposes by submitting that the witnesses have supported the prosecution version and further during post mortem examination external injuries were found on the person of the deceased and cause of death was found asphyxia due to strangulation.

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

However, learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same as early as possible, preferably within nine months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

avin/-

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