

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.34214 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-172 Year-2019 Thana- MINAPUR District- Muzaffarpur

RANJAN SAH @ CHITRANJAN SAH SON OF BASU SAH VILLAGE
TURKI TURAHA TOLI PS MANIPUR DIST MUZAFFARPUR

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Kumar Virendra Narayan, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER**

3 04-03-2022 Heard Mr. Arun Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Kumar Virendra Narayan, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State through video conferencing.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Minapur P.S. Case No. 172/2019 registered for the offence punishable under Section 498(A) and 304(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code 1860.

The prosecution case as per the First Information Report is that the daughter of the informant was married to the petitioner about three years ago. The deceased did not bear child out of the wedlock, upon which, the petitioner along with other accused persons started assaulting and torturing the deceased. It has further been alleged that on 21.4.2019, the informant



received information that the petitioner along with other accused persons has killed the daughter of the informant and had taken the dead body for cremation, and upon receipt of such information, the informant along with his son and other family members arrived at the place of cremation and recovered the dead body from the funeral pyre.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case and has not committed any offence in the manner alleged. He further submits that the deceased had died her natural death and the family members of the deceased also participated in the funeral ceremony. He next submits that at the behest of some enemies, the petitioner along with others have been implicated in the present case.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State referring to the case diary submits that there is specific allegation of torture against the petitioner and other family members that they used to torture the deceased, mentally and physically, due to the fact that deceased did not bear any child even after three years of the marriage, and as per postmortem report, the Doctor has come to the finding that trachea was fractured and the deceased died due to asphyxia on account of



throttling.

Regards being had to the submission made by the parties and taking into consideration the defence of the petitioner that deceased died her natural death whereas from the postmortem report it appears that the cause of death is due to throttling, the petitioner is husband and there is specific allegation of torture against the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant him bail.

Accordingly, the same is rejected.

However, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after one year if the trial does not show any progress.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

S.Ali/-

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

