

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.26367 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -33 Year- 2015 Thana -GAYGHAT District- MUZAFFARPUR

- =====
1. Guddu Ram, son of Visheshwar Ram,
 2. Pappu Ram @ Raj Kishore Ram son of Visheshwar Ram,
 3. Janki Devi wife of Visheshwar Ram,
 4. Sudha Devi wife of Tara Mohan Ram,
 5. Rangeela Devi wife of Guddu Ram,
 6. Visheshwar Ram son of late Hibarun Ram, above are resident of village- Baruari, P.S.- Gaighat, District- Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bela Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Uma Shankar Prasad Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR
JHA
ORAL ORDER

4 01-09-2016 Heard both sides.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in Gaighat P.S.
Case No. 33/2015, registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 304B, 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The aunt of the deceased alleged that she got
information that Phool Kumari Devi was killed in her sasural.
When the informant went to the place of occurrence, the villagers
disclosed that the family members took her dead body for
cremation. The informant rushed there and found half burnt dead
body of the deceased. She informed the police.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that



petitioner nos. 1 and 2 are brothers-in-law and petitioner no. 6 is father-in-law of the deceased. Petitioner no. 3 is mother-in-law and Petitioner nos. 4 and 5 are sisters-in-law of the deceased. They have no manner of concern with the family members of the deceased and her husband. Female members did not take part in the funeral of the deceased, but it appears from the FIR as well as the case-diary and post-mortem report that the deceased was married to Ramshrestha Ram one year ago and she was killed. Post-mortem report shows that the deceased got injury on his head caused by hard blunt substance. When the informant rushed at the place of cremation, half burnt dead body of the deceased was found.

Considering the facts aforesaid and the fact that petitioner nos. 1, 2 and 6 are brothers-in-law and father-in-law of the deceased and they were also found near the cremation ground cremating the deceased, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner nos. 1, 2 and 6 above named on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

So far as the case of petitioner nos. 3, 4 and 5 are concerned, they are mother-in-law and sisters-in-law of the deceased and no specific allegation is made against the above said petitioners. They were not found near the cremation place.

Considering the facts aforesaid and the fact that petitioner nos. 3, 4 and 5 did not find at the place of cremation, petitioner nos. 3, 4 and 5 above named in the event of their arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, are directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Sri S.K. Rai, Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Muzaffarpur in connection with Gaighat P.S. Case No. 33/2015, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J.)

Rakhi

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