

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.77187 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-284 Year-2017 Thana- TEKARI District- Gaya

1. RAJ KUMAR CHAUDHARY @ RAJ KUMAR @ NANHK CHAUDHARY S/o Krishna Chaudhary.
2. Pintu Chaudhary, S/o Krishna Chaudhary.
3. Chottu Chaudhary alias Chottu Kumar, S/o Krishna Chaudhary, All are resident of Village- Titaiganj, P.S.- Tekari, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Diwakar Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ram Sevak Choudhary

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

6 25-06-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their his arrest in connection with Tikkari P.S. Case No.284 of 2017 registered under Sections 302, 201 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the court of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gaya.

The accusation is that the marriage of Urmila Devi, the sister of the informant Naresh Kumar Chaudhary, was performed with the petitioner no.2, namely, Pintu Chaudhary, before 12 years and due to their wedlock, there are two female issue and, at present, the petitioner no.2 used to reside at



Bombay. On 08.07.2017, in the evening at about 07.00 P.M., the informant received information from a person about killing of his sister by her sasural people. Thereafter, the informant along with his villagers went to the sasural village of his sister, then he came to know that the in-laws of her sister killed her.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that the petitioner nos.1 and 3 are brothers-in-laws, whereas the petitioner no.2 is the husband of the sister of the informant and they have falsely been implicated in this case. Further submission is that it would appear from the F.I.R. that the marriage of the sister of the informant was performed with the petitioner no.2 before 12 years and the dead body of the sister of the informant was recovered from a field and not from the house of the petitioners.

On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State opposed the prayer for grant of privilege of pre-arrest bail of the petitioners submitting that the dead body of the deceased was recovered from the field and in the post-mortem examination, one sharp cutting was found on the neck of the deceased, the sister of the informant, and the cause of death of the deceased is said to be the neck injury.

Having considered the facts and the circumstances of



the case and the nature of allegation against the petitioners, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the prayer of the petitioners for grant of anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

P.S./-

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

