

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.84980 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-174 Year-2019 Thana- KARAKAT District- Rohtas

-
1. MANOJ KUMAR MEHTA @ MANOJ MEHTA Son of Ramjee Mehta @ Ramjee Mahto Resident of Village- Vad Tola, P.S.- Karakat, District- Rohtas.
 2. Santosh Mehta @ Santosh Kumar Mehta Son of Ramjee Mehta @ Ramjee Mahto Resident of Village- Vad Tola, P.S.- Karakat, District- Rohtas.
 3. Gita Devi Wife of Manoj Mehta Resident of Village- Vad Tola, P.S.- Karakat, District- Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Arun Kumar Singh
For the State	:	Mr.Binod Kumar
For the Informant	:	Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh-X

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 26-06-2020 Heard Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, the learned senior counsel for the petitioners, the learned APP and the learned counsel for the informant.

The matter has been taken up through video conferencing.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in Dehri (T) Karakat P.S. case No. 174/2019 registered under Section 304B/34 of the IPC.

The informant is father of the deceased. The informant alleged that his daughter, Puja Kumari, was married to Pramod Mehta on 07.05.2018 and she gave birth to a female



child but her husband and other in-laws were always subjecting her to all sorts of torture. Her husband fled away with new born child to Surat but the accused persons continued to torture her. On 02.07.2019 the informant got information that his daughter was killed or died.

The learned senior counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are brothers-in-law and sister-in-law of the deceased. They have no manner of concern with the family affairs of the husband of the deceased. The deceased died of tuberculosis. She was very weak and she gave birth to a female child and during the course of treatment she died. The petitioners informed the father of the deceased immediately after the occurrence at 2.30 in the night, therefore, the petitioners deserve anticipatory bail.

The learned APP and the learned counsel for the informant, however, opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

Perused the FIR and the case diary.

The deceased was married with Pramod Mehta on 07.05.2018 but she was done to death within 14 months of her marriage in her in-laws house. It is case of the petitioners that deceased died of tuberculosis but it is submitted by the learned counsel for the informant that deceased was throttled to death.



The doctor found strangulation around her neck. The witnesses have also reiterated the same facts that the petitioners and others subjected her to all sorts of torture and killed her within 14 months of her marriage.

Considering the facts that, of course, the petitioners are brothers-in-law and sister-in-law of the deceased but since the deceased was throttled to death within 14 months of her marriage in the house of her in-laws where petitioners were also residing with the husband of deceased, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

BKS/-

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

