

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6465 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-13 Year-2004 Thana- RAMPUR CHAURAM District-
Jehanabad

-
1. Gopal Kumar @ Gopal Singh and Ors Late Kunj Bihari Singh Resident of Village - Parampura, PS- Rampur Chaurem
 2. Pintu Singh @ Mintu Singh @ Mantu Sharma Late Kunj Bihari Singh Resident of Village - Parampura, PS- Rampur Chaurem
 3. Basant Sharma Late Oriyar Singh Resident of Village - Parampura, PS- Rampur Chaurem
 4. Chitra Lekha Late Kunj Bihari Singh Resident of Village - Parampura, PS- Rampur Chaurem

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arbind Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Pancha Nand Pandit

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

5 13-05-2019 At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that since petitioner no. 2 has been arrested during pendency of the application, this application with regard to petitioner no. 2 has become infructuous and he may be permitted to withdraw the same.

Permission is accorded.

This application so far petitioner no. 2 is concerned is dismissed as withdrawn.

So far remaining petitioners are concerned, they are apprehending their arrest in connection with Trial No. 187/17,



Chauram P.S. Case No. 13 of 2004 disclosing offences under Sections 304(B) and 201 of the Indian Penal Code.

Petitioner no. 1 happens to be brother in law of the deceased, petitioner no. 2 is the co-villager and petitioner no. 3 is mother in law of the deceased and allegation against them is of causing dowry death of the deceased. It appears that the case is of the year 2004.

Submission of learned counsel for the petitioners is that no specific allegation has been attributed to them and earlier the police after investigation has submitted final form, however, vide order dated 14.09.2010 cognizance has been taken against the petitioners but no summon or warrant of arrest have been issued against the petitioners and they had no knowledge about the same.

Heard learned A.P.P. also.

Having heard both sides, considering the fact that cognizance has been taken in the year 2010 but the petitioners have come before this Court for grant of bail after lapse of nine years, as such, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners rather petitioners may move the court below and make prayer for regular bail and if any such application is filed, the court below will dispose of the same on



the merit of the case and also on the basis of submission of
petitioners, without being prejudiced by this order.

This application is, accordingly, dismissed

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

sunilkumar/-

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

