

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No. 58127 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-92 Year-2018 Thana- BHAWANIPUR District- Purnea

=====

Anita Devi wife of Dhiro Yadav, resident of Village- Shishwa, P.S.
Bhawanipur, District- Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN
AMANULLAH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 13-12-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends arrest in Bhawanipur
(Akbarpur) P.S. Case No. 92 of 2018 dated 17.04.2018 instituted
under Sections 364/370/34 of the Indian Penal Code and 3/4 of the
Dowry Prohibition Act.



3. The petitioner is the married sister-in-law of the daughter of the informant who died under mysterious circumstances.

4. The allegation is that she along with other family members had tortured and pressurized the daughter of the informant for fulfilling the demand of her husband of a motorcycle and Rs. One lakh cash.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that she is the married sister-in-law (*Nanad*) of the daughter of the informant and was living separately since her marriage from much before. It was further submitted that the allegation is only against the husband i.e., brother of the petitioner that she demanded cash and motorcycle but not against the petitioner.

6. Learned A.P.P. submitted that the daughter of the informant was killed without any information or knowledge to the family of the girl and further, from the allegations, it is very apparent that the petitioner was also part of the group which used to torture mentally and physically the daughter of the informant for fulfilling the demand of her brother of dowry. It was submitted that the sequence narrated in the *fardbeyan* are quite natural and cannot be said to be false.



7. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

8. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

AFR/NAFR	
U	
T	

