

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14808 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-83 Year-2019 Thana- SRINAGAR District- West Champaran

ROHIT CHAUDHARY @ ROHIT KUMAR Son of Sri Jagatlal Chaudhary
Resident of Village - Bharpatia, P.S.- Srinagar (Pujaha), District - West
Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Umesh Chandra Verma, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bimlesh Kumar Pandey, Adv
Mr. Anuj Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

4 20-09-2021 In view of sudden resurgence of COVID – 19
infection there is limited functioning of the High Court and
therefore the matter has been listed for consideration through
virtual mode.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for informant who has appeared along with learned APP
for the State.

This Court would expect that the petitioner's
Counsel would honour his undertaking in the instant
proceedings regarding supply of requisite court fee etc. within
two weeks from the date he is called upon to do so by the office.

Petitioner seeks bail in connection with Srinagar P.S.
Case No. 83 of 2019 registered under Section 304B, 201 and 34



of the Indian Penal Code.

Within one year of her marriage, the informant's daughter has been allegedly done to death and thereafter set a blaze.

It is submitted by counsel for the petitioner that it is a case of false implication. Informant is not an eye-witness of the alleged occurrence and the petitioner has no criminal antecedent. Death has occurred due to accident therefore it is a case of false implication.

Learned counsel for the informant along with learned APP have appeared, they have submitted that from the inquest report it is obvious that the victim had suffered 60 percent burn injuries. Unnatural death had occurred at the matrimonial home within 7 months and the FIR discloses demand for dowry and cruelty being inflicted for non-fulfillment of said demand.

Considering these factors the petitioner, husband cannot escape his liability. Instead of being responsible for the dignity and safety of his wife, such occurrence has been taken place.

Petitioner's counsel has submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 28.11.2019.

Considering the rival submissions as also the facts and



circumstances of the case, this Court for the purposes of grant of bail is inclined to accept the submissions advanced by the counsel for the informant and learned APP. This Court, for the present, is not inclined to allow petitioner's prayer for bail. The same is rejected.

The application for bail is thus dismissed.

The Court below, however, would observe that without granting undue adjournment and unnecessary delay, the Trial Court should proceed expeditiously with a view to conclusion of the trial.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

SUMIT/-

U			
---	--	--	--

