

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.12644 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -49 Year- 2015 Thana -ALIPUR District- GAYA

=====

Pintu Kumar, Son of Ram Sevak, resident of Village- Malda, PS Alipur,
District Gaya.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Dewanti Devi W/o Sri Ashok Prajapati R/o Mohalla- Delha, Puna Sawki
Gali, PS Delha, District Gaya.

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmad, Advocate.

For the Opposite Parties : Mr. J.N.Thakur(App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

4 19-07-2016 Heard both sides.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Alipur P.S. Case No. 49 of 2015 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 304(B) and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and under Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

The mother of the deceased made allegation that the petitioner solemnized love marriage with her daughter Poonam Kumari on 02.05.2009. The petitioner happens to be brother-in-law of the eldest daughter of the informant and that is why the petitioner was on visiting term. It is further alleged that after marriage the petitioner begin to demand dowry of Rs. 2,00,000/- and on account of non-fulfillment killed her daughter and disposed

of her dead body.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that mother of the petitioner filed Complaint Case No. 849 of 2015 on 29.05.2015 against the informant and her husband that they assaulted her and demanded money borrowed by her. The father of the petitioner also filed informatory petition against the informant and her husband about the false implication. It is further submitted that the petitioner never solemnized marriage with the daughter of the informant. The petitioner solemnized marriage with another girl in the year 2012 and living with his wife.

It appears that the informant and other witnesses have stated that the petitioner solemnized love marriage with Poonam Kumari and the petitioner is said to have killed her and disposed of her body due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry.

Considering the facts aforesaid, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above named on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J.)

KKSINHA/-

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