

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13277 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-48 Year-2020 Thana- CHENARI District- Rohtas

1. SHARDA KUNWAR W/o Late Raju Sharma R/o village- Doiyan, P.S.- Chenari, District- Rohtas
2. SANTU SHARMA S/o Late Raju Sharma R/o village- Doiyan, P.S.- Chenari, District- Rohtas
3. RAM BRIKSH SHARMA @ JHUMAK SHARMA S/o Sita Sharma R/o vil- lage- Doiyan, P.S.- Chenari, District- Rohtas

... .. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Raghunandan Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/ : Mr. Chaubey Jawahar, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

3 02-03-2022 Learned counsel for the petitioners is directed to re-
move all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within
one month.

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

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection
with Chenari P.S. Case No. 48 of 2020, registered for the of-
fences punishable under Sections 304(B)/34 of the Indian Pe-
nal Code.

Informant, Paras Sharma, lodged an FIR stating
therein that his daughter, Sobha Devi, was married to co-ac-



cused Pramod Sharma in the year, 2019. The customary presents were given at the occasion of the marriage as per the affording capacity of the informant. It has been mentioned that Pramod sharma, his mother Sharda Kumari (petitioner No. 1) and Shankar Sharma, the grand father of the husband of the deceased and *devar* Santu Sharma (petitioner No. 2) started demanding dowry as well as a motorcycle. Due to non-fulfillment of the demand they inflicted atrocities on her. On 29th March, 2020 the informant got an information that the accused persons including the petitioner have done to death the deceased after strangulating her. When informant rushed to the matrimonial house of his daughter he found the dead body of his daughter lying on the ground. It has next been mentioned in the FIR that due to non-fulfillment of dowry demand the accused persons have killed the deceased.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that petitioner No. 1 is mother-in-law and petitioner No. 2 is *devar* and petitioner No. 3 is grand-father in law of the deceased and they have no concern with the dowry demand.

On the other hand, learned APP has submitted that the FIR itself shows that the deceased was done to death due to non-fulfillment of dowry demand.



The FIR itself shows that the marriage was solemnized in the year, 2019 and soon before her death the accused persons inflicted atrocities for non-fulfillment of dowry demand. Investigation is still going on. As such, in my opinion 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 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	
---	--	---	--

