

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.21110 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -194 Year- 2016 Thana -BANMANKHI District- PURNIA

=====

Prakash Kumar Saha @ Babul @ Prakash Kumar Son of Late Vishwanath Saha, Resident of Village- Banmankhi, Gupta Patti, Ward No. 8, P.S. - Banmankhi, District- Purnea.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Anand, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sir Pramod Kumar Pandey, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA

ORAL ORDER

3 22-06-2017 Heard Mr. N.K. Agrawal learned senior counsel for the petitioner and the learned A.P.P.

The petitioner seeks bail in Banmankhi P.S. Case No. 194/2016, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 304B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The brother of the deceased alleged that his sister was married to the petitioner on 11.07.2016 without any dowry, but immediately after marriage, her husband and others began to demand Rs. 10,00,000/- in dowry. On 29.11.2016 his sister called him from mobile no. 7654294356 and disclosed that the accused persons were went upon to kill her. On the date of occurrence



itself, the informant had talk with his sister at about 8.00 in the morning, who disclosed that she was coming, but when the mother of the informant called her daughter at about 10.00 a.m. the petitioner disclosed that her daughter died. The informant came and saw the dead-body lying in the courtyard.

Mr. N. K. Agrawal learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that during the course of investigation next door neighbours namely, Nitish Kumar in para 10, Kiran Devi in para 31, Pinki Devi in para 32 and Munna Jauddar in para 33 have stated that the deceased was behaving abnormally and she committed suicide. When they came inside the house they saw that room was closed from inside and they brought down the dead-body, but it appears from the case-diary that the informant and other witnesses of the deceased made specific allegation that immediately after marriage the petitioner (husband of the deceased) and other in-laws began to demand Rs. 10,00,000/-. The dead-body of the deceased was found lying in the courtyard. Even at about 8.00 in the morning, the deceased had talk with the informant and he disclosed that she was coming, but immediately after two hours her dead-body was found lying in the courtyard.

Considering the facts aforesaid and the fact that petitioner is the husband of the deceased, I am not inclined to



enlarge the petitioner above-named on bail. Accordingly, the same
is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J.)

Vinita/-

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

