

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.68763 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-142 Year-2018 Thana- DULHIN BAZAR District- Patna

Kiran Devi Wife of Krishna Sao, Resident of Village- Kadirganj, P.S.- Dulhin Bazar, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ashok Kumar Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sri Rajendra Prasad Nat

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

3 29-01-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection with Dulhin Bazar P.S. Case No. 142 of 2018 registered under Sections 302, 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act pending in the court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-III, Danapur, District-Patna.

The accusation is that the informant, Ravindra Sao performed the marriage of his daughter, Renu Devi, with Raj Kumar Sao, son of late Bal Kishun Sao, village-Kadirganj, P.S. Dulhin Bazar, District-Patna, in the month of May, 2018 after providing cash and other articles as dowry but she was being



tortured for demand of gold chain. On 11.06.2018, the informant received message on mobile that his daughter has been killed by putting fire, then he went in village Kadirganj but the house of in laws of his daughter was found locked. Thereafter, he informed to the police. When the police came then brother-in-law of his daughter disclosed that all the family members and relatives assaulted to his daughter, Renu Devi, put her on fire and threw the dead body in the well in south of village. On giving information, police reached at well and recovered the dead body of his daughter.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is the Gotni of the deceased and has falsely been implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. Further submission is that Raj Kumar Sao, husband of the petitioner used to reside separate with the family of the petitioner after marriage of daughter of the informant but maliciously the petitioner and her husband have been falsely implicated in this case.

However, learned APP for the State opposed the prayer for bail.

Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of allegations against the petitioner, I am not



inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, her prayer for grant of anticipatory bail stands rejected. The petitioner is directed to surrender before the trial court within four weeks and pray for regular bail, which would be considered by the trial court in accordance with law without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

Devendra/priyanka

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

