

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31309 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-11 Year-2019 Thana- JANTA BAZAR District- Saran

=====

PANKAJ MISHRA, an adult male, aged about 27 years, Son of Sri Amarnath Mishra Resident of Village - Panditpur, P.S.- Janta Bazar, District - Saran (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Saket Gupta

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nand Kishore Prasad

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-05-2019 Heard both sides.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Janta Bazar P.S. Case No.11 of 2019 registered under Sections 498, 307, 34 of the Indian Penal Code. Later on, Section 304(B) I.P.C. was added.

The mother of the deceased alleged that her daughter was married with the petitioner on 25.06.2018 but her husband and other family members were demanding dowry and torturing her. On 17.01.2019, she got information that her daughter was burnt. When the informant came to the house of her daughter, nobody was found inside the house.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was not present in his house. The brother of the



petitioner took the wife of the petitioner to hospital. During the course of treatment, the deceased made statement disclosing that while she was cooking food, accidentally she got burn injury. It is further submitted that Rani Devi, Nikki Kumari and Dheeraj Mishra, sisters-in-law and brother-in-law have already been enlarged on anticipatory bail by a Bench of this Court vide order dated 11.04.2019 passed in Cr. Misc. No.23394 of 2019. The case of the petitioner stands on same footing but it appears that petitioner is the husband of the deceased. Even after occurrence in which the deceased got burn injury no information was given to the informant, mother of the deceased. The marriage of the deceased was solemnised on 25.06.2018 with the petitioner and within six months, she died due to burn injury and before the death, no information was given to the informant.

Taking into consideration the facts aforesaid and the fact that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

Saurabh/-

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

