

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60540 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-388 Year-2018 Thana- MAHUA District- Vaishali

=====

ARUN SINGH S/o Sri Mahadeo Singh R/o village- Chainpur Chakmagahid,
P.S.- Mahua, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bela Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Aditya Narayan Singh.1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 20-11-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 302, 201, 498A, 120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

The prosecution case as lodged by the informant is that marriage of his daughter Soni Devi was performed with Arun Singh (petitioner) before 12 years with Hindu rites and rituals. At the time of marriage, he gave valuable gifts and jewelleryes as per his status. It has further been stated that from their wedlock three daughters and a son was begotten. It has further been alleged that his daughter was tortured and threatened by her husband and in-laws and made a demand of a



motorcycle and Rs. 2 lacks cash as dowry. It has further been stated that his daughter informed that then for peaceful life, he gave a splendor motorcycle to them after selling his land but even they tortured his daughter for Rs. 2 lakhs. It has further been alleged that he was informed that his daughter was killed by the all the FIR named accused persons as he failed to fulfill the demand of Rs. 2 lakh. After getting information when he along with his relative went to the sasural of his daughter, her house was locked and no family member were present at the house.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He submits that petitioner has got no indulgence in the alleged occurrence and has been implicated only for the reasons that petitioner is husband of the daughter of the informant (deceased). He submits that the said occurrence took place after 12 years from the date of marriage. He submits that there is no eye witness to the said occurrence and nothing comes against the petitioner. He further submits that the in-laws have been granted the bail by coordinate Bench of this Court.

Learned counsel for the State submits that there is specific allegation against the petitioner. He further submits that



petitioner is the husband of the deceased.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, his payer for anticipatory bail is rejected in connection with Mahua P.S. Case No. 388 of 2018 pending before the court of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vaishali at Hajipur.

Accordingly, the application is dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

devendra/-

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

