

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8251 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-103 Year-2021 Thana- DEO District- Aurangabad

Kamendra Kumar Son Of Shivdutt Mehta R/O Village- Ishraur, P.S.- Deo,
District- Aurangabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, Sr. Adv,
	:	Mrs. Mukul Kumari
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Shailendra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

7 09-01-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State.

The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with
Deo P.S. Case No. 103 of 2021 instituted for the offence under
Sections 304(B), 120(B), 201 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegations against the petitioner is due to
non-fulfillment of dowry demand of a four wheeler vehicle,
petitioner along with co-accused persons started to torture the
informant's daughter thereafter they killed her.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner
that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence.
Petitioner is husband of the deceased due to which he has been
made accused in this present case. There is no any consistent
evidence found in respect of dowry demand and torturing to the
deceased. It is also submitted that the petitioner has himself



given information to the father of deceased that she left the house but did not return. Petitioner is in custody since 19.1.2021.

Learned APP appearing for the state and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer of regular bail and submitted that the petitioner is husband of the deceased and during investigation witnesses supported the prosecution story. From perusal of Postmortem report, the cause of death has been opined by the doctor as hemorrhage, coma and shock due to injuries caused by sharp edge cutting weapon.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of allegation, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and, as such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.

The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same within a period of six months.

However, if the trial of the petitioner is not concluded within a period of six months, he would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

amandeep/-

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

