

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.21400 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-203 Year-2018 Thana- SONO District- Jamui

VIKASH YADAV, Son of Yaddu Yadav, Resident of Village - Sebejor, P.S.-
Sono, Distt.- Jamui.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Pankaj Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Murli Dhar, APP
	Mr. Akash Raj, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRIYA
ORAL ORDER

3/ 30-05-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State as well as counsel for the informant.

Petitioner seeks bail in **Sono P.S. Case No.203 of 2018** instituted for the offence under Section(s) 304-B/34 Indian Penal Code pending in the Court of the **1st Additional Sessions Judge, Jamui.**

In the written report, it is alleged that daughter of the informant was married with this petitioner. She was tortured in her *Sasural* for demand of dowry. It is alleged that *panchayati* was also held for the purpose, but accused persons continued to commit torture. It is further alleged that on 26.07.2018 the informant made telephone call to this petitioner to enquire about his daughter then he told that his daughter has fled away somewhere from the house. The informant went to *Sasural* of



his daughter and learnt that his daughter has been thrown in the well by the accused persons after committing her murder. Later on, her dead body was recovered from the well. All the accused persons had fled away.

Counsel for the informant submits that dead body was recovered from the well. Cause of death was due to drowning and blockage of air root. Counsel for the informant further submits that own uncle of the petitioner has stated in para 21 of the case diary that she was tortured in her *Sasural* for demand of dowry. Similar statement has been made by the villager in para 22 of the case diary.

The petitioner is husband of deceased.

In such circumstances, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage.

Prayer of the petitioner for grant of bail is **rejected at this stage.**

The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and make all efforts to conclude the same as early as possible, preferably, within a period of nine months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Liberty is given to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail after nine months, if no substantive progress is made in



the trial.

(Sanjay Priya, J)

J. Alam/-

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

