

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.46238 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-521 Year-2020 Thana- HARSIDHI District- East Champaran

1. DHRUV SINGH @ DHRUP SINGH @ DHRUV BHAGAT S/o LATE MANGAL BHAGAT R/o VILLAGE-DHAWAHI KHALSA TOLA, P.S-HARSIDHI, DISTRICT-EAST CHAMPARAN
2. PRITHVI RAJ S/o DHRUV SINGH @ DHRUV BHAGAT R/o VILLAGE-DHAWAHI KHALSA TOLA, P.S-HARSIDHI, DISTRICT-EAST CHAMPARAN
3. VARUN RAJ @ VARUN BHAGAT S/o DHRUV SINGH @ DHRUV BHAGAT R/o VILLAGE-DHAWAHI KHALSA TOLA, P.S-HARSIDHI, DISTRICT-EAST CHAMPARAN

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Tiwari
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Prem Kumar Jha

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

4 28-07-2022 The learned counsel for the petitioners is directed to remove all the defects pointed out by the office within one month.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Harsidhi P.S. Case No. 521 of 2020 registered for offence punishable under sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code and later on section 306 of the Indian Penal Code was found true.

As per allegation, the informant Shanti Devi was



searching some customer to sell her land for the marriage of her daughter Asha Kumari (deceased). On 04.12.2020, she went out of her house to participate in the marriage of one Rakesh Bhagat. Meanwhile, the petitioners killed the daughter of the informant by forcibly administering poisonous substance.

The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are innocent and independent witnesses in the case diary have stated that the informant started residing with her first husband due to which the deceased Asha Kumari was annoyed and she committed suicide by consuming poisonous substance. He has also submitted that the doctor Amarnath Singh in paragraph 42 of the case diary has stated that two days prior to her death the deceased had come in his clinic complaining stomachache. Later on, he came to know that she had died.

On the other hand, the learned counsel for the informant has submitted that the witnesses, in paragraphs 9, 10 and 11 of the case diary, have stated that the petitioners were making pressure on the informant to transfer her land in their favour and they threatened her to kill had their demand remain unfulfilled. Later on, the petitioners committed murder of the deceased by administering poisonous substance.



Considering above-mentioned facts and circumstances, I do not find to be a fit case for anticipatory bail and accordingly the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

The petitioners are directed to surrender before the court below and make a prayer for regular bail, that shall be disposed of on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioners within the stipulated time mentioned hereinabove, failing which, the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Mahesh/-

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

