

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No. 33032 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -44 Year- 2017 Thana -CHENARI District- SASARAM (ROHTAS)

=====

Shri Kant Pandey S/o Bihari Pandey @ Rajendra Pandey Resident of
Village- Chenaridih, P.S. Chenari, District- Rohtas

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar Pandey

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umesh Lal Verma

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2. 20-07-2017 Heard Sri Jitendra Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for
the petitioner and learned Addl. Public Prosecutor.

The petitioner, husband of the deceased, has prayed
for grant of anticipatory bail in Chenari P.S. Case No. 44 of 2017
registered for offence under Sections 304(B)/201 of the Indian
Penal Code.

It was submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner
that the deceased complained stomach pain and thereafter, she was
treated, but she subsequently died and it was not a case for dowry
death. He further submits that in the petition, he has stated that the
marriage of deceased with petitioner was solemnized in the year
2009 and as such, there can't be application of Section 304 (B) of
the Indian Penal Code, since marriage was solemnized beyond



eight years.

It is evident in the F.I.R. that the informant, who is resident of the same district, had complained that demand of Alto Car was made and due to non-fulfillment, it appears that his daughter was done to death and dead-body was disposed of on the same date i.e. on the date of death (27-02-2017).

Considering the nature of allegation, as made in the F.I.R., I do not find any ground to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

Anay

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

