

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12800 of 2020**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-298 Year-2018 Thana- SIKANDRA District- Jamui

SANTU YADAV @ SANTU KUMAR, S/o Suresh Yadav R/o village-
Pachmahua, P.S.- Sikandra, District- Jamui

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Amar Prakash

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dr. Kumar Uday Pratap

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 09-07-2020

Heard leaned counsel for the petitioner
and the leaned A.P.P. for the State through video
conferencing.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in
connection with Sikandra P.S. Case No. 298 of 2018, for the
offences under Sections 323, 341, 498(A) and 304(B)/34 of the
Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act,
pending in the court of learned J.M. 1st Class, Jamui.

The accusation is that marriage of Puja Kumari,
daughter of complainant/informant Savita Devi, was
performed with the petitioner Santu Yadav on 09.05.2017
according to Hindu customs. While she was kept at her
matrimonial house eight months properly, but, thereafter,
her husband Santu Yadav and her mother-in-law Girija Devi



started torturing to her for demand of Freeze and Apachy motorcycle, in dowry, and information was also sent to her Myaka on telephone and she was being tortured through various modes for which her daughter became ill and she went at Sadar hospital for treatment, where Rahul Yadav and Seema Devi also assaulted her and, ultimately, she died on 09.06.2018 and her funeral was also performed.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submits that, in fact, petitioner is the husband of deceased, who was admitted at Sadar Hospital due to suffering from high fever, which would appear from Annexure-3, and from where she was referred to PMCH, but she died. Further submission is that admittedly, the petitioner is the husband of deceased and she died within three years of her marriage at her matrimonial house.

Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of allegation against the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, his prayer for grant of pre-arrest bail stands rejected.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

