

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40596 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-84 Year-2020 Thana- PURUSHOTTAMPUR District- West  
Champaran

=====

HARI RAM SON OF HEERA RAM, R/O VILLAGE- PAKUAHWA, P.S.-  
MAINATAND, DISTRICT- WEST CHAMPARAN. ... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar. ... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bimlesh Kumar Pandey

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ram Bilash Roy Raman

=====

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

**ORAL ORDER**

4      02-02-2023                      Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as  
the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection  
with Purushottampur P.S. Case No. 84 of 2020 registered for  
offence punishable under Sections 304B, 201/34 of the Indian  
Penal Code.

As per allegation, the marriage of daughter of the  
informant was solemnized with the petitioner six years prior to  
lodging of the FIR. The couple have two children, i.e., a  
daughter of five years and another son of two years. The  
accused persons subjected her to cruelty for non-fulfillment of  
Rs.5,00,000/- and a motor cycle. When she expressed inability  
to fulfill the demand, the petitioner and his family members  
tortured her. The petitioner went to Chandigarh for his job, but  
even from Chandigarh, he used to threaten the daughter of the



informant on telephone to kill, had she not fulfilled the demand. On 18.10.2020, the accused persons named in the FIR, the father-in-law, brother-in-law and son-in-law of the father of the petitioner assaulted the daughter of the informant. On information, the informant went there and he was informed by his relatives that a dead body is lying in a field of sugarcane. He went there and identified the dead body of his daughter.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent. At the time of occurrence, he was not present at the spot, rather he was in Chandigarh for his job.

On the other hand, the learned APP has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that there is allegation against the petitioner that from Chandigarh, he used to threaten the deceased on telephone.

Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the court below and make a prayer for regular bail. It is not a fit case for anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

**(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)**

Mahesh/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

