

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11768 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-361 Year-2018 Thana- JAGDISHPUR District- Bhojpur

1. JHARBARI KUNWAR @ JHAWARI KUNWAR Wife of Lalu Ram
Resident of Village - Baulipur, P.S.- Jagdishpur, Distt - Bhojpur.
2. Khusbu Devi @ Khushbu Devi Wife of Vinay Kumar Resident of Village -
Berkap P.S.- Darihat, Distt - Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nawal Kishore Prasad, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 29-09-2021 Heard Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, learned counsel for
the petitioners and Mr. Nawal Kishore Prasad, learned
Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State.

Petitioners seek anticipatory bail in connection with
Jagdishpur P.S. Case No. 361 of 2018 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 304(B)/34 and 201 of the Indian
Penal Code-1860.

This is second attempt for grant of anticipatory bail on
behalf of the petitioners inasmuch as earlier the bail application
of the petitioners was dismissed as withdrawn by this Court vide
order dated 03.07.2019 passed in Cr. Misc. 13182 of 2019.

The allegation, as per the First Information Report, is



that the daughter of the informant was married to Pinku Ram on 23.02.2018 according to Hindu rites. It is further alleged that after sometime the petitioners along with other accused persons started demanding a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- for purchase of four wheeler. The informant further disclosed that on 1.10.2018 in the morning, his daughter had a talk with his son and at about 8.32 AM the co-accused called his son and told that his sister has died, and when the informant reached the matrimonial home of his daughter, he found that the accused persons have forcibly cremated the dead body.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are in-laws of the deceased and have not committed any offence in the manner alleged. He further submits that the husband of the deceased who has also been made accused No. 1 in the present First Information Report, has been acquitted by the Trial Court. As such, the petitioners on this very ground have again moved before this Court for grant of anticipatory bail.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the anticipatory bail of the petitioners was rejected earlier by this Court but, instead of submitting to the jurisdiction of the trial court, the petitioners



remained absent and absconded during course of trial and further that the deceased died a few months after the marriage in her matrimonial home, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners which has been moved for the second time.

Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners stands rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

S.Ali/-

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

