

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44805 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-120 Year-2020 Thana- SAHARGHAT District- Madhubani

Raushan Kumar Yadav Son of Ramprit Yadav, R/O Village- Vishanpur, P.S.-
Saharghat, District- Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, Sr. Advocate Mr. Madhav Raj, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mrs. Meena Singh, A.P.P.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Gagan Deo Yadav, Advocate Mr. Ravi Prakash, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 23-02-2023 Heard learned Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, Senior Counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Gagan Deo Yadav and Mr. Ravi Prakash, learned counsel for the informant as well as Mrs. Meena Singh, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

Let the defects, as pointed out by the office, be removed within a period of four weeks from today.

Petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498A, 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act. Later on charge sheet was submitted under Sections 302, 304B, 313 and 315 of the Indian Penal Code.



According to prosecution case, petitioner, who is husband of the informant/complainant is said to have ousted the informant/complainant from her matrimonial home in association of her family member over the dowry demand.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that petitioner is the husband of the deceased and the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. is false and fabricated.

Vide order dated 04.02.2023 a report was called for with regard to the present stage of trial. Report dated 14.02.2023 reveals that charge has been framed against the petitioner on 31.03.2022 and the case is pending on the stage of evidence and out of ten witnesses, four witnesses have already been examined.

The learned counsel for the informant and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the Stage have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

Considering the aforesaid facts, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail in connection with Saharghat P.S. Case No. 120 of 2020 pending in the court of learned A.C.J.M.- II, Madhubani.



Prayer is refused.

However, the learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

mdrashid/-

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

