

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49761 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-270 Year-2016 Thana- KARAHGAR District- Rohtas

=====

Anand Kumar Ram @ Anand Ram Son of Srinivas Ram Resident of Village-
Sonbarsa, P.S.- Kargahar, District- Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Chandra Mohan Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Mukeshwar Dayal

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER**

2 25-11-2021 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in Karaghar P.S. Case No.
270 of 2016 corresponding to Sessions Trial No. 215 of 2017,
registered for the offence punishable under Sections 304B, 34 of
the Indian Penal Code and section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition
Act.

As per the prosecution case, niece of the informant
was married with petitioner in the year, 2016 and thereafter, it is
alleged that she was subjected to torture and harassment for
dowry and due to non-fulfillment of the same this petitioner
along with others killed the niece of informant.

It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that
informant is not eye-witness of the occurrence. Entire allegation



is false and concocted. In fact, petitioner is mentally ill and he was under treatment before marriage. Dispute arose between the spouses and on the spur of the moment petitioner assaulted his wife (deceased), as a result of which she died. Petitioner is in custody since 12.12.2016 having no criminal antecedent.

Counsel for the informant however, vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that petitioner is husband of the deceased. There is specific and direct allegation against petitioner that this petitioner killed his wife by sharp cut weapon due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry. The deceased died at her matrimonial home within seven years of her marriage in unnatural circumstances.

Considering the facts aforesaid, nature of allegation and the fact that petitioner is husband of the deceased, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above-named on bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

vinita/-

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

