

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39435 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-11 Year-2022 Thana- WARISLIGANJ District- Nawada

1. Manish Kant Son Of Pramod Prasad @ Pramod Kumar Resident Of Village - Vaghi (Chakwai), Police Station- Warisaliganj, District - Nawada.
2. Pramod Prasad @ Pramod Kumar Son Of Baleshwar Prasad Resident Of Village - Vaghi (Chakwai), Police Station- Warisaliganj, District - Nawada.
3. Renu Devi @ Ranju Devi Wife Of Pramod Prasad @ Pramod Kumar Resident Of Village - Vaghi (Chakwai), Police Station- Warisaliganj, District - Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/S

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjeev Ranjan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shahabuddin Azeem @ S. Azeem

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 07-09-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
APP for the State.

The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their arrest
in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section
304(B)/ 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that
the petitioner no.1 is brother-in-law, petitioner no.2 is father-in-
law and petitioner no.3 is mother-in-law and are persons with
clean antecedent and the informant alleges that his daughter was
married to Utpal Kant @ Pintu Prasad in the Year 2018. After
marriage, the accused persons including the petitioners were



torturing his daughter for dowry of Rs.5 Lacs. It is next alleged that due to non-fulfilment of the dowry demand, she was killed by poisoning.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is next submitted that it was the husband of the deceased, who had informed the informant that his daughter has consumed poison. It is also submitted that informant participated in the cremation after post mortem of the body was done. It is next submitted that had the petitioners killed the deceased, then definitely they would have tried to dispose of the body and the body would not have been sent for post mortem. It is also submitted that informant realizing his mistake on intervention of the well-wishers filed a joint compromise petition as it has been specifically stated at Para-12 of the anticipatory bail. The learned counsel next submits that though the offence is not compoundable, but since a compromise petition has been filed and the petitioners are related to the deceased in the manner as indicated herein above and the allegation against them are general and omnibus in nature and they are separate in mess and property from the husband of the deceased and hence, the case for anticipatory bail be considered.



Learned A.P.P. opposes the bail application.

Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners, above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, are directed to be released on bail on their furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending in connection with Warisaliganj P. S. Case No.11 of 2022, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

