

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.77678 of 2018**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-53 Year-2017 Thana- PIYAR District- Muzaffarpur

Md. Ashique @ Md. Asshik @ Ashik S/o Md. Subhan @ Nathuni Miya @  
Md. Nathuni, R/o Vill.- Govindpur Chhapra, P.S.- Piar, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                            |   |                                                                                                                  |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s       | : | Mr.Pradhan Murli Manohar Prasad, Advocate<br>Mr. Raju Kumar Goswami, Advocate<br>Mr. Pawan Kumar Singh, Advocate |
| For the Opposite Party/s : |   | Mr. Dinesh Singh, APP                                                                                            |
| For the Informant          | : | Mr. Priyank Samdarshi, Advocate                                                                                  |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      12-04-2019                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned  
counsel for the informant as well as learned Additional Public  
Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioner is languishing in custody for the  
offences punishable under Section 304B/34 of the Indian Penal  
Code and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act in  
connection with S.T. No.766 of 2017, arising out of Piar P.S.  
Case No.53 of 2017.

The petitioner is in custody since 03.06.2017. He  
is husband of the victim of dowry death. Marriage was  
solemnized in the year 2013.

Allegation is that deceased was being assaulted



bitterly for non-fulfillment of dowry demand and the death was result of torture soon before death. There is no dispute that unnatural death was caused to the victim.

Learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail.

Considering the entire facts, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Hence, the prayer for bail is refused. Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same preferably within nine months.

**(Birendra Kumar, J)**

Mkr./-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

