

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14144 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-227 Year-2021 Thana- DESARI District- Vaishali

Ravindra Kumar, son of Jay Mangal Das, resident of Village-Mansayi Shlaha
(Mohammadpur Pohiyar), P.S.-Desari, District-Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Adv Mr. Vijay Anand, Adv
For the Informant	:	Mr. Dharmesh Kumar, Adv
For the State	:	Mr. Md. Fahimuddin, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

4 12-04-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner,

informant and learned A.P.P appearing on behalf of the

State.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a

case registered for the offences punishable under

Sections 304(B), 201, 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Earlier the petitioner had filed Cr. Misc. No.

22078 of 2022 for grant of anticipatory bail which was

withdrawn vide order dated 14.11.2022.

The accusation is of killing the daughter of the

informant by all her in-laws family members including



the petitioner.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that during pandemic COVID-19, the daughter of the informant got seriously infected from corona virus. She was thereafter hospitalized in Krishna Hospital, Shahpur Patori, Samastipur where the doctor examined the victim and referred for better treatment to PMCH, Patna but during course of shifting, she died. The informant was thereafter informed about the death of his daughter but due to fear of spread of corona virus infection, he denied to participate in cremation and later on filed the present F.I.R against the petitioner and other family members. There is general and omnibus allegation against all the F.I.R named accused person including the petitioner.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant and learned A.P.P appearing on behalf of the State have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of



the petitioner and submitted that petitioner is husband of the deceased and he has fully responsible for the commission of murder of his wife. The deceased was five months pregnant and she was burnt to death. In paragraph 8 of the case diary, the own uncle of the husband of the deceased has supported the case of the prosecution. The processes under Sections 82 and 83 have already been issued against the petitioner.

Considering the fact that petitioner is husband of the deceased and the deceased died just within three years of her marriage, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. The prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner stands rejected.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

Shageer/-

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

