

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.12215 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-158 Year-2017 Thana- RUPASPUR District- Patna

=====

RANJAN SINGH @ RAVI RANJAN SINGH @ RAVI RANJAN S/o
Surendra Singh, R/o Village- Chougaon, P.S.- Sridala, District- Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhay Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Manish Kumar 2

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

3 04-04-2018 Heard learned counsels for the petitioner and the State.

Petitioner seeks bail in connection with Rupaspur P.S.

Case No. 158 of 2017 registered for the offence punishable
under sections 304B/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits
that petitioner is the husband and has been falsely implicated in
this case in order to give it the colour of dowry death. No such
offence, as alleged, has taken place. The allegations are general
and omnibus in nature for demand of motorcycle. As a matter of
fact, the deceased herself committed suicide. Immediately on
getting information, petitioner took her to hospital through an
Ambulance, where she was declared dead. Petitioner did not
flee away, rather he tried his best and later informed Police also.
Post mortem report also shows that there was no bodily injury



on the deceased except the ligature mark, which makes it a clear cut case of suicide.

Learned Addl. P.P. appearing for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that there is specific allegation of demand of Motorcycle against this petitioner. During investigation, witnesses have also supported the prosecution case. Moreover, petitioner being the husband was very much responsible for maintaining his wife with full honour and dignity, in which he failed. Learned counsel, therefore, submits that petitioner does not deserves to be granted privilege of bail.

Considering the nature of allegations levelled, the materials available on record and the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of bail to the petitioner. The prayer for bail is, therefore, rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

mcv/-

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

