

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44069 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2 Year-2021 Thana- BIHTA District- Patna

JAY KUMAR RAY @ JAY KUMAR SINGH Son of Daroga Rai R/o-
Dumariya, P.S. - Bihta, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 44109 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2 Year-2021 Thana- BIHTA District- Patna

1. VIKASH KUMAR @ VIKASH RAI Son of Jay Kumar Ray R/o- Dumariya,
P.S.- Bihta, District - Patna
2. Priye Ranjan @ Prince Rai Son of Jay Kumar Ray R/o- Dumariya, P.S.-
Bihta, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 44069 of 2021)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ghanshyam Tiwary

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Pradeep Narain Kumar

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 44109 of 2021)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ghanshyam Tiwary

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Md. Iftekhar Mahmood

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

ORAL ORDER

2 12-04-2022 Learned counsel for the petitioners is directed to remove
all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within one month.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the
learned APP for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with



Bihta P.S. Case No. 02 of 2021, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 304 (B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

As per allegation, the informant's daughter Lilam Kumari was married to co-accused Guddu Kumar. Her husband and in-laws subjected her to atrocity after the marriage. On 02.01.2021 at about 9 a.m., the informant got the information about the death of her daughter, he rushed to her matrimonial house and after uplifting the *kaphan* he saw the face of the deceased and found ligature mark around her neck. He expressed his firm belief that her husband Guddu Kumar, Vikash Rai and Prince Rai, petitioners in Cr. Misc. No. 44109 of 2021, and Jay Kumar Ray, have committed her murder. It has also been mentioned that after marriage the accused persons were demanding Rs. 7,00,000/- as dowry.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in the entire *fardbeyan* there was no mention of demand of dowry but in last portion of the FIR it has been added Rs. 7,00,000/- were demanded as dowry. He has submitted further that the petitioners are father-in-law and brothers-in-law (devar) of the deceased and they live separately.

The petitioners are named in the FIR and there is allegation of committing dowry death and before her death of infliction of the atrocities. The investigation is still going on. As such, it is not a fit case for anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners



is rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioners 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	
---	--	---	--

