

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7225 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-272 Year-2018 Thana- BARURAJ District- Muzaffarpur

-
1. LAL BABU MAHTO S/O- KIRIT MAHATO, R/O- VILLAGE KORIGANVA, PS- BARURAJ, DIST- MUZAFFARPUR.
 2. PRABHA DEVI W/O- LAL BABU MAHTO, R/O- VILLAGE KORIGANVA, PS- BARURAJ, DIST- MUZAFFARPUR.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bhavesh Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rajendra Singh

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

ORAL ORDER

6 08-03-2022 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 and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Baruraj P.S. Case No. 272 of 2018 registered for offence punishable under sections 304B and 120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

It is a case of dowry death. The informant Jai Kishun, Mahto is the father of Priyanka Kumari (deceased).

As per allegation, the accused persons including the petitioners were making demand of Rs.1,00,000/- cash in dowry and due to non-fulfillment of dowry demand, they were inflicting



atrocities on her. On 30.10.2018, the informant got a telephonic information that his daughter is no more. He reached to the matrimonial house of his daughter and found her dead body in hanging position. The matrimonial inmates were not present there.

The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are mother-in-law and father-in-law of the deceased and they have no concern with the dowry demand.

The case diary has been received and in paragraph nos.9, 10 and 11 of the case diary the witnesses have supported the prosecution case and it has been found that soon before her death, the deceased was subjected to cruelty for non-fulfillment of dowry demand.

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

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	
---	--	---	--

