

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18568 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-220 Year-2019 Thana- PANAPUR District- Saran

JAY DAYAL RAM Son of Late Shivchand Ram Resident of Village -
Dhanauti, P.S.- Panapur, Distt.- Sarana at Chapra.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jeetendra Narayan, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Parmanand Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 07-10-2020 Heard Mr. Jeetendra Narayan, learned counsel for
the petitioner and Mr. Parmanand Kumar, learned Additional
Public Prosecutor appearing for the State through video
conferencing.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Panapur P.S. Case No. 220 of 2019 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 304-B, 201 and 120B of the Indian
Penal Code 1860.

The allegation against the petitioner as per the First
Information Report is that the daughter of the informant
namely, Sarswati Kumari (since deceased) was married to Vijay
Ram on 4.7.2018 and on 21.11.2019 she was killed by the
petitioner along with his other family members.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner has not committed any offence in the manner alleged. He happens to be the father-in-law of the deceased. Learned counsel further submits that there is no ingredient of Section 304B of the Indian Penal Code in the First Information Report and falsity of the First Information Report is apparent from the fact that even the co-accused residing outside India has been dragged in this case. Learned counsel further submits that all the family members of the deceased had participated in the funeral of the deceased.

Learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, vehemently opposes the prayer for regular bail and referring to paragraphs 21, 22, 23 and other paragraphs of the case diary submits that just before the deceased was killed by the accused persons she was tortured by the petitioner and his family members due to the fact that the deceased was willing to go to her maternal home for attending marriage ceremony which was not being allowed by the accused persons. Learned counsel further submits that dead body of the deceased has not been cremated and the same was thrown in the river *Gandak*. Learned counsel also submits that death of the deceased has taken place within one year of the marriage in suspicious condition in her matrimonial home and the petitioner is father-in-law of the



deceased. Therefore, the petitioner does not deserve regular bail.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the materials on record and the fact that within one year of marriage, the victim has died in her matrimonial home, I am not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner at this stage.

Accordingly, the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

Petitioner may however renew his prayer for bail after one year from today if the trial does not show any progress.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

S.Ali/-

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

