

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43907 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-477 Year-2020 Thana- MAKHDUMPUR District- Jehanabad

SREE NARAYAN KUMAR @ SREE NARAYAN YADAV Son of
Duleshwar Yadav Resident of Village - Narayanpur, P.S.- Makhdumpur,
District - Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Umesh Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dr.Mrityunjaya Kr.Gautam, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

3 18-07-2022 Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to remove
all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within one month.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Dr.
Mrityunjay Kumar Gautam, learned Addl.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Makhdumpur (Tehta) P.S. Case No. 477 of 2020, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 302, 201, 34 of the Indian Penal
Code.

Manju Devi, the informant is the mother of the deceased,
Seema Devi. As per allegation, Seema Devi was married to the
petitioner ten years prior to lodging of the FIR. On 16.12.2020, the
informant had telephonic conversation with her daughter. Next day at
about 8 p.m. the petitioner informed the informant through telephone
that Seema Devi had died. The informant rushed to the matrimonial
house of her daughter and she came to know that the present



petitioner along with other co-accused persons named in the FIR disappeared the dead body of Seema Devi after killing her.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that couple were leading happy conjugal life. There is no allegation in the FIR in respect of dowry demand. He has also submitted that the FIR has been lodged after three days of the occurrence. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also submitted that both the parties have compromised the case.

The learned Addl.P.P., Dr. Mrityunjay Kumar Gautam has submitted that after killing the deceased the accused persons concealed the dead body and when the informant went to the matrimonial house the dead body was not there.

In the impugned order it has been mentioned that the dead body was disposed of hurriedly before arrival of the informant.

Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances it does not appear to be a fit case for anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioner within the stipulated time provided in para-1 hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

SONALI/-

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

