

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Miscellaneous No.18453 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -61 Year- 2016 Thana -CHOUTARWA District-
WESTCHAMPARAN(BETTIAH)

=====

Raghvendra Yadav @ Ragwendra Yadav @ Raghuwendra Sahni Son of
Lalman Yadav, Resident of Village- Jainitola, P.S.- Chautarwa Bathwariya,
District- West Champaran. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bimlesh Kumar Pandey

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Ram Bachan Singh

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

3 23-05-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP representing the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Choutarwa
P.S. Case No. 61 of 2016 registered for the offences punishable
under Sections 304B, 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Rabita Devi, the sister of the informant, was married to
the petitioner about four years ago and out of the wedlock there is
a daughter. Allegedly, after marriage the in-laws started
demanding motorcycle and gold chain, due to non-fulfillment she
was being tortured and in spite of request made by the informant
the petitioner and others did not allow her to go to her naihar to
participate in the marriage ceremony of her own sister, thereafter,
she was made traceless. It is alleged that after killing her, her dead
body was made traceless.



Submission is of false implication and that the first information report has been lodged after delay of 2 days, as a matter of fact the wife of the petitioner committed suicide as her brother refused to take away her in marriage ceremony. The dead body was cremated in presence of the informant and his family members, thereafter, the informant lodged this case only with a view to extract money and as such the petitioner deserves sympathetic consideration.

Learned APP seriously opposes the prayer of bail by submitting that the dead body was not found, resulting, chargesheet has been submitted under Section 364, 498A/34 IPC and 3 /4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, considering that the petitioner is the husband and there is allegation against him also, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail, accordingly, his such prayer stands rejected.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

avin/-

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

