

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.62914 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-226 Year-2017 Thana- HAJIPUR SADAR District- Vaishali

-
1. Sundar Devi @ Sundrawati Devi wife of late Niranjan Rai
 2. Mina Devi wife of Rajeev Rai
 3. Shobha Devi wife of Pawan Kumar Rai
 4. Rajeev Rai @ Ajit Kumar, Son of late Niranjan Rai,
All Resident of Village-Subhai, Nayatola, P.S.-Hajipur Sadar, Distt.-Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ajay Kumar Mishra
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sri Ganesh Prasad Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 13-02-2019 Heard both sides.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in Hajipur Sadar P.S. Case No.226 of 2017 registered under Sections 307 and other sections of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners was earlier rejected by order dated 20.09.2017 passed in Cr.Misc.No.43550 of 2017 but the petitioners again filed this anticipatory bail petition with new facts and developments. It is further submitted that the informant herself compromised the case and filed an affidavit stating that she was under depression and she got burn injury while cooking food but the enemies of the family of the in-laws



got this case instituted. It is further submitted that if any case is lodged for demand of dowry and torture, the informant often makes allegation against her husband but the informant did not make any allegation against her husband.

From perusal of records, it appears that the informant made allegation against these petitioners that her mother-in-law poured kerosene oil on her body, Rajeev Rai and Meena Devi caught her and Shobha Devi ignited fire on her body causing burn injury. On consideration of the facts and gravity of the offence, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners was earlier rejected. Now the compromise petition is a sort of effort made by the petitioners to tamper with the evidence.

Having considered the facts aforesaid, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

Harish/-

U			
---	--	--	--

