

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68757 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-199 Year-2016 Thana- ROSERA District- Samastipur

Deelip Yadav Son Of Kokai Yadav Resident Of Village - Dhatha, P.S- Rosera,
Distt.- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ranjit Kumar Yadav

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Binod Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

3 13-09-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a

case registered for the offences punishable under Section

364 of the Indian Penal Code.

The prosecution case as per F.I.R is that the

informant alleging therein that his son-in-law namely,

Deelip Yadav, the petitioner has filed a Divorce Case No.

48 of 2014 in which a compromise was made and

informant's daughter Puja Kumari went to her

matrimonial house on 25th of November, 2015 with the

petitioner. Informant's daughter Puja Kumari also filed a



Complaint Case No. 375 of 2014 for dowry atrocities against her husband and his family members on 06th of July, 2016. Some people of his daughter's matrimonial house informed him that his daughter was taken away somewhere by the accused persons with intention to kill her and throw her body. Informant tried to search her but did not succeed in searching her. When accused persons did not come with his daughter on 11th of July, 2016 in court on the date fixed for hearing, then the informant believed that his daughter has been thrown anywhere after killing her.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case because he happens to be the husband of the victim. It is further submitted that the victim was mentally ill and she had gone somewhere out of her own sweet-will.

Learned APP for the State after going through the Case-Diary has vehemently opposed the prayer for



the anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submitted that petitioner being the husband of the victim was the sole responsibility to take care of his wife but the petitioner has failed in his responsibility as husband of the victim. The independent witnesses have also supported the prosecution case. The victim has not yet been traced out.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, this court is not inclined to grant prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner stands rejected.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

Shageer/-

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

