

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.47676 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -115 Year- 2015 Thana -GOH District- AURANGABAD

=====

Pawan Yadav @ Pawan Kumar, S/o Late Jaynath Yadav, R/o Village -
Piprahi, P.S. - Goh, District - Aurangabad.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dharendra Kumar Sinha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Smt. Meena Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 26-04-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the

State.

The petitioner being the husband of the informant is languishing in custody since 19.11.2015 in connection with Goh P.S. Case No.115/2015, pending before the learned CJM, Aurangabad, registered for the offences punishable under section 498A of the Indian Penal Code and sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, subsequently, section 304B IPC was also added.

Prosecution case as per 'Fardbeyan' of the victim is that the victim had married the petitioner but after few days of the marriage the accused persons started torturing her for non-fulfillment of dowry demand. Thereafter, about eight days of marriage, the victim came to her parents' house from her matrimonial house when on 12.07.2015, the husband of the



victim came to her parents' house and took her on the pretext of getting her treated but on way assaulted the victim badly, as a result the victim after pouring kerosene oil put herself on fire.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that as per own admission of the victim she put herself on fire after pouring kerosene oil and she was being provided medical assistance by the petitioner.

The report of the learned Additional Sessions Judge-II, Aurangabad, received through Letter No.28, dated 23.03.2017 suggests that out of 8 charge-sheeted witnesses, one witness has been examined and one witness has been tendered by the prosecution. Informant, doctor and the I.O. of the case have not been examined for which process has already been issued against them and the trial is likely to be concluded within a period of five months.

In view of the time frame, for concluding the trial as stipulated in the report of the learned Court below, this court is not inclined to interfere.

Accordingly, the application renewing the prayer for bail on behalf of the petitioner is rejected.

It is expected from the learned Court below to conclude the trial within the stipulated time frame.



It is expected from the Superintendent of Police,
Aurangabad, to get the witnesses produced on the date fixed.

Let a copy of this order be transmitted to the
Superintendent of Police, Aurangabad, through FAX/E-mail.

(Dinesh Kumar Singh, J)

Ashwini/-

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

