

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35497 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-216 Year-2019 Thana- PARSA District- Saran

CHANDRAMA RAM Son of Supan Ram Resident of Village - Sobhey Parsa,
P.S.- Parsa, Distt.- Saran at Chapra.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Krishna Kumar Yadav, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Nazir Ansari, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 24-01-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State through virtual court proceedings.

Let the defect(s), if any, be removed within a period
of four weeks after complete start of the physical Court.

The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Parsa P.S. Case No. 216 of 2019 instituted for the offences
under Sections 304(B), 328 and 120(B)/34 of the Indian Penal
Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is in custody since 05.03.2021, is a person with clean
antecedent, charge-sheet has been submitted and charges have
also been framed and the trial is going on.

The allegation as alleged in the FIR is that the
informant alleges that his daughter (deceased) was married with
the petitioner on 18.05.2019 and after marriage the petitioner



and his family member started demanding Rs.2,00,000/- and a gold chain and on non-fulfillment of the demand led to killing the deceased by poison.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The deceased was a lady with frail health and she fell ill and she was taken to the Doctor and further no person would kill his own wife within such a short span of time.

Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner and submits that the marriage took place on 18.05.2019 and she died within 40 days of marriage i.e. on 30.06.2019 and further para 8 of the bail application records that she might have taken poison which itself indicates that the deceased was perturbed and anguished by the conduct of the petitioner and his family member, hence, they also apprehend that she might have taken poison.

Considering the fact that the petitioner is the husband and para 8 of the bail application records that she might have taken poison which in itself demonstrate that the petitioner was apprehensive that his wife might have committed suicide by consuming poison, the Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner in connection with the aforesaid case pending in the



Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Saran at Chapra.

Accordingly, prayer for bail is refused.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

