

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10363 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-211 Year-2020 Thana- GAUTAMBUDHNAGAR District- Si-
wan

-
1. SHANTEE DEVI WIFE OF BASISTH SINGH RESIDENT OF VILLAGE-
BUDHI CHAPRA POLICE STATION-GB NAGAR DISTRICT-SIWAN
 2. BASISTH SINGH SON OF LATE BINDESHWARI SINGH RESIDENT
OF VILLAGE-BUDHI CHAPRA POLICE STATION-GB NAGAR DIS-
TRICT-SIWAN

... .. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Raghav Prasad, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Iftekhhar Mahmood, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

5 21-03-2022 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
G.B. Nagar P.S. Case No. 211 of 2020, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 304(B)/201/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

As per allegation, the accused persons subjected Ranjeeta
Devi (deceased) to torture for non-fulfillment of rupees one lac cash
and a golden chain. The further allegation is that they strangled
Ranjeeta Devi to death and stealthily cremated dead body. The infor-
mant received information from the villagers on 08.08.2020, and
when she rushed to the matrimonial house of the deceased, no one



was there and the door was found locked. There, she was apprised by the villagers that the matrimonial inmates were torturing the deceased prior to two days of the death of the deceased.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are father-in-law and mother-in-law of the deceased. He has also submitted that there is no explanation of delay of four days in lodging the FIR.

There is specific allegation against the petitioners that being the father-in-law and mother-in-law of the deceased, they subjected the deceased to atrocities for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry. The witnesses in paragraph Nos. 25, 26 and 27 of the case diary have also supported the alleged occurrence and the name of the the petitioners have also been figured in the statement of these witnesses.

Considering the above-mentioned facts, 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	
---	--	---	--

