

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12395 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-32 Year-2020 Thana- PUNAURA District- Sitamarhi

1. MEERA DEVI Wife of Jagdish Thakur Resident of Village - Khairwa, P.S.-
Punaura, District - Sitamarhi
2. Jagdish Thakur Son of Ram Balam Thakur Resident of Village - Khairwa,
P.S.- Punaura, District - Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. N.K.Agrawal, Sr. Advocate Mr.Virendra Kumar Ms. Pretty Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr Shailendra Kumar, APP.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

8 29-03-2022 The learned counsel for the petitioners is directed

to remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter

within one month.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and

learned APP for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest for the

offences alleged under Section 304(B)/34 of the Indian Penal

Code, registered in connection with Punaura P.S.Case No.32 of

2020.

The marriage of the informant's daughter Sadhna

Kumari with Santosh Kumar was solemnized on 13.12.2015. As



per allegation, the petitioners and the husband Santosh Kumar demanded Rs. 1,50,000/- from the deceased. When she expressed inability to fulfill the demand, the accused persons threatened her to kill and they assaulted her. On 28.02.2020, the informant received an information that her daughter Sadhna Kumari was strangled to death. When he went there, he saw the dead-body of Sadhna Kumari lying on a bed and except Santosh Kumar, other family members had absconded.

The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are mother-in-law and father-in-law of the deceased and they are not concerned with the dowry demand and they never inflicted atrocity on the deceased. He has also submitted that the marriage was solemnized five years ago and considerable period of cordial matrimonial life was elapsed.

There is specific allegation in the FIR itself that along with the husband, the petitioners were also inflicting atrocity on the deceased for non-fulfilment of the demand of dowry. When the informant went to the house of his daughter, the petitioners absconded.

The learned APP Mr. Shailendra Kumar have submitted that the witnesses in paragraph nos. 2,3,7 and 8 of the case diary have supported the case.



Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, it is not a fit case for anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail on behalf of the petitioners is hereby rejected.

If the petitioners surrender and make prayer for regular bail in the court below, the same shall be considered and disposed of on its own merit, without being prejudiced by this order.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioners within the stipulated time as provided hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/-

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

