

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16862 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-89 Year-2020 Thana- ARER District- Madhubani

-
1. MD. KARIM Son of Md. Khalil Resident of Village - Ektara, P.S. - Arer, District - Madhubani
 2. Md. Khalil Son of Late Sabdul Resident of Village - Ektara, P.S. - Arer, District - Madhubani
 3. Rukshana Khatoon @ Majjo Khatoon Daughter of Md. Khalil Resident of Village - Ektara, P.S. - Arer, District - Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ratanakar Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Pradip Narain Thakur

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

8 18-04-2022 Heard learned counsels for the petitioners and
the State.

Petitioners apprehend arrest in connection with
Arer P.S. Case No. 89 of 2020 registered for the offence
punishable under section 302, 120B of the Indian Penal
Code.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners
submits that petitioners have not committed any offence as
alleged in the first information report and he has been
falsely implicated in this case due to previous enmity and
land dispute. The daughter of the informant was suffering

from depression because her husband was doing job in foreign country and as such she committed suicide. Petitioners have no criminal antecedent.

Learned Addl. P.P. appearing for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that petitioners are named accused in the first information report and there are allegations against them. During investigation materials have come showing complicity of the petitioners in the alleged crime. Further, since the husband used to reside in foreign country, the responsibility to keeping the deceased with full honour and dignity, in which they failed. Petitioners, therefore, do not deserve to be granted the privilege of bail.

Considering the nature of allegations levelled, the materials available on record and the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. The same is, therefore, rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

mcv/-

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